

# THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL OF THE GOVERNOR OF MADRAS.

Tuesday, the 30th January 1934.

The House met at eleven of the clock, Mr. President (the hon. Mr. B. RAMACHANDRA REDDI) in the Chair.

## PRESENT :

Usman Sahib Bahadur, K.C.I.E., The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed.  
Krishnan Nayar, Kt., The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M.  
Campbell, K.C.I.E., C.S.I., C.B.E., V.D., I.C.S., The hon. Sir Archibald.  
Stokes, K.C.I.E., C.S.I., I.C.S., The hon. Sir Hopetoun.  
Raja of Bobbili, The hon. the.  
Rajan, The hon. Mr. P. T.  
Kumaraswami Reddiyar, The hon. Diwan Bahadur S.  
Abdul Hameed Khan Sahib Bahadur.  
Ahmed Miran Sahib Bahadur.  
Alamelumangathayaramma, Mrs. K.  
Annamalai Chettiyar, Mr. S. A. A.  
Appadurai Pillai, Diwan Bahadur A.  
Arasu, Mr. V. T.  
Basheer Ahmed Sayeed Sahib Bahadur.  
Basu Dev, Mr. C.  
Bayappa Reddi, Mr. P.  
Beyabani Sahib Bahadur, S. M. K.  
Bhanoji Rao, Mr. A. V.  
Birley, Mr. F.  
Davis, Mr. J. A.  
Devadasan, Mr. M.  
Dharmalingam Pillai, Rao Sahib V.  
Duraiswami Reddiyar, Mr. K. M.  
Ellappa Chettiar, Diwan Bahadur S.  
Gopalaswami Mudaliyar, Diwan Bahadur M.  
Gopalaswami Ayyangar, Diwan Bahadur N.  
Harischandrudu Nayudu, Mr. A.  
Hood, Esq., I.C.S., Mr. H. M.  
Indrayya, Mr. C.  
Jagannatha Raju, Rao Bahadur G.  
Jagannatham, Mr. H. M.  
Jayaram Nayudu, Rao Sahib C.  
Kesavaramamurti Nayudu, Mr. K.  
Khalif-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur P.  
Koti Reddi, Mr. K.  
Krishnayya Choudari, Mr. P. V.  
Krishnamurti, Rao Bahadur D.  
Krishnan, Mr. C.  
Krishnaswami Ayyar, Kt., Diwan Bahadur Sir Alladi.  
Kuppuswami Choudari, Mr. J.  
Ladden, Mr. W. W.  
Lakshmana Reddi, Mr. G.  
Langley, Mr. W. K. M.

Madanagopal Nayudu, Mr. R.  
Mahboob Ali Baig Sahib Bahadur.  
Mahmud Shehnad Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur.  
Manikkavelu Nayakar, Mr. M. A.  
Methrell, Mr. J. K.  
Millar, Mr. W. H.  
Moidoo Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur T. M.  
Moses, Mr. P. C.  
Muhammad Meera Ravuttar, Mr. K. P. V. S.  
Muniswami Nayudu, Diwan Bahadur B.  
Muthiah Chettiyar, Mr. M. A.  
Muthu Chettiyar, Rao Bahadur P. C.  
Nachiyappa Gounder, Mr. K. A.  
Nadimuthu Pillai, Mr. A. Pl. N. V.  
Nanjappa Bahadur, Subadar-Major S. A.  
Narasa Reddi, Mr. T.  
Narasimhaswami, Rao Sahib D. V.  
Narayanan Nambiyar, Mr. V. P.  
Natesa Mudaliyar, Rao Bahadur C.  
Palat, Mr. R. M.  
Pannirselvam, Rao Bahadur A. T.  
Parthasarathi Ayyangar, Mr. C. R.  
Patnaik Mahasayo, Sriman M. G.  
Patro, Kt., Rao Bahadur Sir A. P.  
Pattagar of Palayakottai, Rao Bahadur. Peddi Raju, Mr. P.  
Pocker Sahib Bahadur, B.  
Premayya, Mr. G. R.  
Rajagopala Pillai, Mr. P. V.  
Raja of Khallikote.  
Ramachandra Padayachi, Mr. P. K.  
Ramakrishna Reddi, Mr. A.  
Ramamurti, Rao Sahib Pandit Ganala.  
Raman Menon, Mr. K. P.  
Ramaswami Ayyar, Mr. T. S.  
Ramaswami Mudaliyar, Mr. V. M.  
Ranganatha Mudaliyar, Mr. A.  
Ranganatha Mudaliyar, Mr. G.  
Ranganatha Mudaliyar, Mr. M. D. T.  
Rangaswami Reddi, Mr. M. B.  
Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar, Diwan Bahadur C. S.  
Sahajanandam, Swami A. S.  
Sami Venkatachalam Chetti, Mr.  
Sesha Reddi, Mr. B. P.  
Shetty, Mr. A. B.  
Simhachalam Pantulu, Mr. G.

[30th January 1934]

## PRESENT—cont.

Singam Ayyangar, Mr. K.  
 Siva Raj, Rao Sahib N.  
 Smith, c.i.e., I.C.S., Mr. E. Conran.  
 Soundara Pandian, Mr. W. P. A.  
 Sreshta, Mr. M. S.  
 Srinivasa Ayyangar, Mr. T. C.  
 Srinivasan, Rao Bahadur R.  
 Sriramulu, Mr. G.  
 Subbarayan, Dr. P.  
 Subrahmanya Chetti, Rao Sahib P.  
 Subrahmanya Bhatt, Mr. U. C.  
 Sundara Rao Nayudu, Mr. T.  
 Syed Tajuddin Sahib Bahadur, Khan Sahib.  
 Thangal, Mr. P. M.

Thomas, Mr. Daniel.  
 Thorne, c.i.e., I.C.S., Mr. J. A.  
 Vasudeva Pillai, Mr. V. G.  
 Vedachala Mudaliyar, Mr. M.  
 Venkatarama Ayyar, Mr. K. R.  
 Venugopal Nayudu, Rao Bahadur R. K.  
 Viswanatha Rao, Diwan Bahadur V. N.  
 Yahya Ali Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur.  
 Yakub Hasan Sahib Bahadur.  
 Zamindar of Chemudu.  
 Zamindar of Kirlampudi.  
 Zamindar of Mirzapuram.

## I.—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

## STARRED QUESTIONS

## Education

*Sanction of Government for the appointment of religious instructors in Muhammadan schools.*

\* 538 Q.—Mr. P. V. KRISHNAYYA CHOUDARI: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that a Government Order has been issued permitting the appointment of religious instructors for Muhammadan pupils in recognized Muhammadan secondary and elementary schools;

(b) under what category are such instructors to be classified by district educational councils for calculating grants to these teachers; and

(c) what the reasons are for the Government according such permission only to the Muhammadan community?

A.—(a) The hon. Member is referred to G.O. No. 1727, Education, dated 22nd September 1933, which has been placed at the disposal of the press.

(b) Religious instructors as such are not eligible for grants from district educational councils.

(c) The Government Order quoted above explains the reasons for the concessions allowed therein in regard to the provision of religious instruction for Muslim pupils.

Mr. K. KOTI REDDI:—"May I ask the hon. Minister whether he will consider the question of introducing religious instruction with regard to other communities also?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—"The Government Order itself distinguishes the case of Muslims from other communities and gives special reasons for making this concession in favour of the Muslims. I do not see, in the circumstances, how this question arises at all."



30th January 1934]

Mr. P. V. KRISHNAYYA CHOUDARI:—" May I know whether the Government think that the other communities do not require this religious instruction? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—" It does not follow at all."

## Industries

### *Disbandment of weaving parties.*

\* 539 Q.—Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(a) why weaving parties are disbanded; and

(b) whether there is any proposal before the Government to revive them in the near future?

A.—(a) The weaving parties were disbanded as a measure of retrenchment principally, because it was reported that the weavers had not come forward to benefit by the assistance which the parties offered.

(b) No.

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—" May I ask whether the Government will consider the advisability of reviving these weaving parties? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—" Not until the finances improve substantially."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" May I enquire if other measures necessary for the relief of the condition of weavers are contemplated? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—" This money is required for other expenditure."

Mr. K. KOTI REDDI:—" May I know whether the Government have investigated the reason why the weavers are unwilling to take advantage of the benefits which the parties offered? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—" It is a matter which the weavers can answer better than the Government."

Mr. K. KOTI REDDI:—" May I know whether the Government is investigating into these reasons? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—" We know the fact that they do not take interest in these matters."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" May I know whether the large number of weavers and their dependents do not require relief? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—" I cannot answer a question like that offhand."

[30th January 1934]

**Agriculture**

*Levy of duty by His Exalted Highness the Nizam's Government on rice exported from this Province.*

\* 540 Q.—Mr. P. V. KRISHNAYYA CHOUDARI:—“ Will the hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received any reply from the Government of His Exalted Highness the Nizam on the matter referred to in answer to question No. 322, dated 3rd November 1933; and

(b) whether they have addressed the Government of India on the question of negotiating the modification of the commercial treaty of 1802 with His Exalted Highness the Nizam by the removal of 5 per cent duty on rice?

A.—(a) His Exalted Highness the Nizam's Government are still considering the matter.

(b) No.

Mr. P. V. KRISHNAYYA CHOUDARI:—“ May I ask why the Government have not mentioned this matter and addressed a letter to the Government of India? ”

The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN:—“ Unless we know what the Government of His Exalted Highness the Nizam has to say in the matter, we cannot do anything.”

Mr. P. V. KRISHNAYYA CHOUDARI:—“ My question is about the removal of the 5 per cent duty on rice? ”

The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN:—“ We are awaiting the reply of the Nizam's Government.”

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—“ May I know when correspondence was started with the Nizam's Government on this point? ”

The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN:—“ I cannot say off-hand.”

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—“ May I know whether any reply has been received? ”

The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN:—“ The printed answer contains the information.”

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—“ The answer says that the Nizam's Government are still considering the matter. My question is whether any reply has been received? ”

The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN:—“ I am afraid I cannot add anything to what has already been said.”

*Measures for improving the level of prices of paddy and other agricultural produce.*

\* 541 Q.—Mr. P. V. KRISHNAYYA CHOUDARI: Will the hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state categorically what specific steps have been taken till now and what proposals are still

30th January 1934]

under consideration of the Government for bringing about an improvement in the prices of paddy and other agricultural produce in this province?

A.—The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answers given to questions Nos. 85 and 354 on 2nd August 1933, and 4th November 1933, respectively. The Agent, South Indian Railway, has since reported that the concession rates of railway freight for rice exported to Colombo would be continued until a further notification is issued. The Government have also under consideration in connexion with the Budget Estimate for 1934-35 proposals for the constitution of a Provincial Marketing Board and the appointment of a Provincial Marketing Officer to assist the Board in improving the marketing facilities for agricultural produce. The Government propose to appoint at once a special officer to conduct preliminary inquiries and collect statistics in regard to the prices of rice and the marketing facilities available for it which will be useful to the Provincial Marketing Officer proposed to be appointed in the next financial year.

Khan Bahadur MAHMUD SCHAMNAD SAHIB Bahadur:—" May I know whether the Government have done anything to prevent the importation of Japan and Siam rice into our province? "

The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN:—" The Government have not done anything in the matter, because the quantity imported is not such as to warrant action."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" Besides taking action in the manner done, viz., the appointment of a special officer or provincial marketing officer, may I ask whether the Government have explored the possibility of establishing co-operative sales and marketing society? "

The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN:—" The special officer will consider that question."

Mr. P. V. KRISHNAYYA CHOUDARI:—" Sir, the Telugu districts are all bordering on the M. & S.M. Railway. May I know why the Government have not taken steps to secure concession rates from that railway? "

The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN:—" If there is necessity for getting concession from the M. & S.M. Railway, the Government will take steps therefor."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—" Are Government taking any steps to control the import of foreign rice? "

The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN:—" This Government are not taking any steps."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" May I ask whether the duties proposed to be given to the provincial marketing officer cannot be done by the Co-operative Department? "



[30th January 1934]

The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN:—"To some extent they can and they are doing them."

Mr. M. S. SRESHTA:—"Are there any figures showing the quantity of foreign rice imported?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN:—"Notice, Sir."

Mr. K. P. RAMAN MENON:—"Have the Government taken steps to prevent the bringing in copra from Ceylon?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN:—"No."

Mr. K. KOTI REDDI:—"Are the Government prepared to recommend to the Government of India the imposition of a heavy duty on rice imported into this country?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN:—"The hon. Member's suggestion will be considered."

### Local Self-Government

*No-confidence motion against the President, Taluk Board, Guntur.*

\* 542 Q.—Mr. P. V. KRISHNAYYA CHOUDARI: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state what action the Government have taken on the vote of no confidence passed by the Taluk Board, Guntur, on its president?

A.—Government have taken no action in the matter as the question whether or not the motion had been passed by the requisite majority was not free from doubt.

Mr. P. V. KRISHNAYYA CHOUDARI:—"May I ask why the Government have not taken any action on the resolution passed by the Guntur Taluk Board?"

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"For the information of the hon. Member, I may state that we have issued a notice to the Taluk Board to show cause why it should not be dissolved."

Mr. P. V. KRISHNAYYA CHOUDARI:—"Is it after the passing by that taluk board of the motion of no-confidence in its chairman that the order to show cause against dissolution was issued?"

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"The reasons are stated in the notice. But I may state there has been a deadlock in the taluk board for the last so many months."

Mr. P. V. KRISHNAYYA CHOUDARI:—"May I ask whether the Government have mentioned the no-confidence resolution in their notice?"

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"The no-confidence motion has nothing to do with our action."

30th January 1934]

Mr. P. V. KRISHNAYYA CHOUDARI:—" My question is whether the Government have passed any orders on the no-confidence motion passed by the Guntur Taluk Board? "

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" As the matter is not free from doubt, the Government have left the matter to be decided in a court of law."

Mr. P. V. KRISHNAYYA CHOUDARI:—" May I know whether the Government have asked them to go to a court of law? "

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" I never stated any such order has been passed."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—" I find from the answer given here that the matter is not free from doubt. May I ask what the circumstance was that was responsible for this Government taking the drastic step of dissolution? "

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" There is no connexion between the two cases. The reason for issuing the notice was the deadlock existing there for the last so many months."

### Medical Administration

#### *Women's dispensary, Sivaganga.*

\* 543 Q.—MRS. K. ALAMELUMANGATHAYARAMMA: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) the average number of males, females and children daily attending the out-patients' women's dispensary in the Government Hospital at Sivaganga;

(b) whether a largely signed memorial from the citizens of Sivaganga has been received by the Government stating that there is no longer any need for the continuance of the Government Women's Dispensary; and

(c) what action the Government have taken on the memorial?

A.—(a) There is no separate dispensary for women in the Government Hospital at Sivaganga. A statement<sup>a</sup> showing the daily average attendance of patients in the out-patients' department of the Government Hospital, Sivaganga, is laid on the table.

(b) A memorial signed by about 126 persons was received by the Government.

(c) As there is no separate Government dispensary for women at Sivaganga, the Government did not take any action on the memorial.

[30th January 1934]

**Irrigation**

*Irrigation Conference between the Madras and the Mysore Governments regarding the Palar river.*

\* 544 Q.—**MR. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:** Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the question of the failure of freshes in the Palar river was discussed in the Conference reported to have taken place recently between the Madras and Mysore Governments;

(b) whether the attention of this Conference was drawn to the findings of the Committee of Enquiry appointed by the Madras Legislative Council;

(c) the decisions, if any, arrived at; and

(d) whether the Government will be pleased to publish the proceedings of the Conference?

A.—(a) The question that was discussed at the Conference was the supply by Mysore of certain statistics and other information relating to tanks in Mysore territory in the Palar basin.

(b) Yes.

(c) The decision was that Mysore undertook to examine whether, and to what extent it was possible to supply the information asked for by this Government and if so, at what cost.

(d) There are no proceedings of the Conference relating to this matter requiring publication other than the decision referred to in the answer to clause (c) above.

**MR. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:**—“ May I know, Sir, why the information called for by the Palar Committee regarding the capacity of certain tanks in the Palar basin has not been furnished? ”

**The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:**—“ I have explained before now, and I think it is also explained in the answer to this question, that we have been in correspondence with the Mysore Government regarding the obtaining of the information asked for by the Committee. The Mysore Government have now undertaken to make an examination to see whether the information required can be supplied at a reasonable cost.”

**MR. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:**—“ May I ask the hon. the Revenue Member whether it is not a fact that the attention of the Madras Government has been called to certain encroachments in the capacity and certain improvements in the Mysore territory of the Palar basin and, if so, what answer they have to give to this encroachment? ”

**The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:**—“ Allegations have been made to that effect, but the Mysore Government have not admitted them.”



30th January 1934]

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" May I know what steps the Madras Government have taken to verify the truth or falsity of the allegations made? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" In one case a sepecific allegation was made of encroachment in a tank near Kolar; enquiries were made in that case and the allegations proved to be false."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" May I ask whether the attention of the hon. the Revenue Member has not been called to the fact that even an executive engineer of the Government has drawn the attention of the Government to the fact that one large tank—the Ammankarai tank—has been improved upon to the detriment of the ayacutdars of the Palar basin? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" I must ask for notice of the question."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" Will the hon. Member consider the seriousness of the situation and the immediate desirability of ascertaining the truth of that allegation? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" I have already stated that I require notice of the question relating to the allegation."

*Information called for by the Palar Enquiry Committee.*

\* 545 Q.—Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the information called for by the enquiry committee with reference to certain tanks in the Palar basin has been furnished by the Mysore Government;

(b) when was the information called for; and

(c) what steps the Government propose to take to ascertain and collect the information required at least now?

A.—(a) No.

(b) 27th April 1931 and lastly at the Conference of the 4th September last held at Bangalore.

(c) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer to clause (c) of question No. 544.

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" May I ask whether during these 2½ years no information has been forthcoming and whether this is a satisfactory state of affairs in the view of the Government? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" I have already stated that we have asked for steps to be taken by the Government of Mysore

[30th January 1934]

to obtain as much information as possible. This is not information which is at the disposal of this Government and we cannot get it by force from the Mysore Government. We can only get it by negotiation and we are carrying on negotiations."

**Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:**—" May I ask how long this question has been before the Government? "

**The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:**—" I must ask for notice of the question."

*Decision of the Mysore Government regarding the supply of more water to the Palar.*

\* 546 Q.—**Diwan Bahadur A. APPADURAI PILLAI:** Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the question relating to the paucity of freshes in the Palar river has been discussed with the officers of the Mysore State, and finally settled;

(b) if so, whether in accordance with that decision, the Mysore Government have undertaken to let down more water into the Palar, to the benefit of the ryots dependent on the Palar supply; and

(c) whether the Government would be pleased to publish the decision reached for the information of the public?

A.—**The hon. Member's attention is invited to the answer to question No. 544.**

**Diwan Bahadur A. APPADURAI PILLAI:**—" May I ask whether the Government of Mysore have furnished the statistics required? "

**The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:**—" I have not received any statistics."

**Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:**—" May I ask whether it is the intention of this Government not to press for statistics, if the Mysore Government thinks that the cost would be heavy? "

**The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:**—" When we know what the cost would be, we can consider whether we should pay for it. We cannot expect the Mysore Government to spend a lot of money to provide information for us."

**Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:**—" Under the treaty, certain obligations are placed upon the Mysore Government by the British Government. When the allegation is that this obligation has been broken, is it not the duty of the Mysore Government to answer the allegation? "

**The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:**—" I do not think it is clear that the treaty obligations have been broken. The person making those allegations should prove them."

30th January 1934]

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" Will the hon. Member act if a definite concrete instance of how this obligation has been broken is placed in his hands? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" I will consider the question, Sir."

*Information called for from the Mysore Government regarding the Palar irrigation.*

\* 547 Q.—Mr. M. A. MANIKKAVELU NAYAKAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) with reference to question No. 546, dated 3rd November 1931, and question No. 58, dated 2nd August 1933, whether the information called for from the Mysore Government regarding Palar irrigation has since been received;

(b) if so, whether the Government will be pleased to place it on the table of this House; and

(c) if not, what the delay is due to?

A.—The hon. Member's attention is invited to the answers to question Nos. 544 and 545.

*Suspension of the tank restoration schemes.*

\* 548 Q.—A. M. AHMED MIRAN SAHIB Bahadur: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) when exactly the tank restoration schemes were suspended, and for what reasons;

(b) when they would be resumed; and

(c) whether the Government are aware of the heavy damage sustained by the minor irrigation sources during the recent heavy floods in the districts of Tinnevely and Ramnad?

A.—(a) In December 1931, as a measure of retrenchment.

(b) They will be resumed only after a definite improvement in the financial position has established itself as explained in answer to question No. 477 given on 24th January 1933 and to question No. 738 given on 22nd March 1933.

(c) Yes.

Mr. DANIEL THOMAS:—" May I know, with reference to clause (c), what measures the Government are proposing to take in order to remedy the damages sustained by minor irrigation sources in Ramnad and Tinnevely? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" The damages are being repaired as rapidly as possible."



[30th January 1934]

11-15 a.m. Diwan Bahadur M. GOPALASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" May I know from the hon. the Revenue Member whether the Government propose to do anything in the direction of restoring the tanks in the Ceded Districts during the financial year? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" I must ask for your ruling, Mr. President, whether that question arises out of the question under discussion."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" From clause (c) of the question it is clear that the question only refers to Ramnad district. Therefore the question of Mr. Gopalaswami Mudaliyar is not in order."

*Removal of silt in the Kanigiri Reservoir.*

\* 549 Q.—The KUMARARAJA OF VENKATAGIRI: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state whether the Government have considered the desirability and necessity of removing silt in the Kanigiri reservoir and if so, what their proposals are?

A.—No.

Khan Bahadur YAHYA ALI SAHIB Bahadur:—" May I know from the hon. the Revenue Member whether the necessity of removing silt in the Kanigiri reservoir was brought to the notice of the Government? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" No, Sir."

Khan Bahadur YAHYA ALI SAHIB Bahadur:—" May I know from the hon. Member, when he inspected this place recently, whether he was personally informed of the necessity of carrying out this work? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" No, Sir."

*Provision of falling shutters on the Pennar anicuts at Sangam and Nellore.*

\* 550 Q.—The KUMARARAJA OF VENKATAGIRI: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) at what stage is the proposal to fix up falling shutters on the Pennar anicuts at Sangam and Nellore;

(b) when the work is likely to be taken up and completed; and

(c) whether any provision will be made in the budget for 1934-35 for the same?

A.—(a) The proposal is under the consideration of the Board of Revenue.

(b) It is not possible to say.

(c) No.

Khan Bahadur YAHYA ALI SAHIB Bahadur:—" With reference to the answer given to clause (a) of this question, may I know from the

30th January 1934]

hon. Member for how long the question has been under the consideration of the Board of Revenue and when they are likely to come to a conclusion?"

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—"I must ask for notice of the question."

### Public Service

*Employment of ex-army men by Collectors and District Judges.*

\* 551 Q.—Subadar-Major S. A. NANJAPPA Bahadur: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) the number of applications for appointment received from ex-army men by the Collectors and District Judges in each district since 1st January 1933;

(b) the number of ex-army men given employment in the Collectorate as well as the District Judges' offices in each district;

(c) the number of applications for employment rejected and the reasons thereof;

(d) the number of new appointments made in the department; and

(e) the number of applications for employment from the sons of ex-army men, number employed and the number rejected and the reasons thereof for each district?

A.—(a), (b), (d) & (e) The Government have no information.

(c) A statement\* embodying the information available with the Government is annexed.

### Administration of Justice

*Appearance before Sub-Magistrates' Courts of persons not qualified to act as pleaders.*

\* 552 Q.—Sriman M. G. PATNAIK Mahasayo: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether complaints have been received by the Government that, contrary to the provisions of law, certain persons not qualified to practise as pleaders are allowed systematically to appear and conduct criminal cases in the Courts of the Sub-Magistrates of Narasannapeta, Parlakimedi, Tekkali, Russellkonda (in the Ganjam district) and of Vizianagram, Palkonda, Chipurupalle and Narasapatam (of the Vizagapatam district); and

(b) the action taken by the Government on such complaints?

A.—(a) Certain resolutions passed at the general body meeting of the Ganjam Bar Association held on the 18th December 1933 have been communicated to Government.

(b) No action has been taken by Government on the resolutions.

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"May I know from the hon. the Law Member whether any action is contemplated to be taken by

[30th January 1934]

the Government against those unauthorized persons who have been practising in those courts? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—“ It is a matter entirely for the High Court.”

### Forests

#### *Memorandum on forest grievances submitted by the South Kanara Landholders' Association.*

\* 553 Q.—MR. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have recently received a memorandum on the forest grievances submitted by the South Kanara Landholders' Association; if so, whether the hon. Member will be pleased to lay a copy of the same on the table of the House; and

(b) what action the Government have taken or propose to take on the same?

A.—(a) Yes. The Memorandum<sup>a</sup> is placed on the table of the House.

(b) It is under the consideration of the Government.

### Prisons and Prisoners

#### *Supply of buttermilk to 'C' class prisoners.*

\* 554 Q.—MR. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state whether any orders have been passed by Government regarding the supply of buttermilk to 'C' class prisoners as promised by the hon. Member during the last meeting; if not, when it is likely to be passed?

A.—The answer to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. The second part of the question does not arise.

MR. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—“ May I know if the hon. the Law Member has issued orders that buttermilk should be supplied to 'C' class prisoners? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—“ No, Sir.”

MR. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—“ May I know whether the hon. the Law Member proposes to do it? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—“ I do not propose to do it.”

MR. K. KOTI REDDI:—“ May I know from the hon. the Law Member what orders then have been passed regarding this question? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—“ My answer to my Friend, Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan's question, implies the answer to this question. The order is that buttermilk will not be included in the diet to 'C' class prisoners.”

<sup>a</sup> Printed as Appendix III at pages 200-210 infra.



30th January 1934]

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—“ May I know if the Government have stated any reasons for disallowing the supply of buttermilk? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“ Government have plenty of reasons for passing such an order.”

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—“ May I have some of the reasons from the hon. Member for not supplying buttermilk to ‘ C ’ class prisoners? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“ One of the reasons is that the number of civil disobedience prisoners on whose behalf this demand for the supply of buttermilk is being made has fallen considerably. The number at the end of December 1933 is roughly 160. I believe it is even less than that now.”

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—“ May I know, if the number increases, the Government propose to introduce the supply of buttermilk? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“ That will be considered when the number increases again.”

Mr. K. KOTI REDDI :—“ May I know if the Government will be pleased to issue a communiqué giving all the reasons for not supplying buttermilk to ‘ C ’ class prisoners for our edification and future action? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“ I shall consider my friend’s suggestion.”

## UNSTARRED QUESTION

### Economic Condition

*Damage to life and property due to the cyclone.*

555 Q.—Mr. M. B. RANGASWAMI REDDI : “ Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) in what parts of the Presidency the recent cyclone worked its havoc;

(b) what the extent of damage caused to property, livestock and lands is;

(c) the number of casualties; and

(d) what steps have been taken to compensate for the damage caused, if any?

A.—The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the Press Communiqué, dated the 12th January 1934.

## NON-OFFICIAL BUSINESS.

[Note.—An asterisk (\*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS IMPARTIBLE ESTATES ACT, 1904 (BILL No. 11 OF 1932).

\* Sriman M. G. PATNAIK Mahasayo :—“ Mr. President, Sir, I beg to present the Madras Impartible Estates Act, 1904 (Bill No. 11<sup>a</sup> of 1932) as reported on by the Select Committee and move that the Bill, as amended by the Select Committee, be taken into consideration.”

[30th January 1934]

Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"I second it."

\* Mr. C. BASU DEV:—"I rise to move that the consideration of this Bill be adjourned till 1st February 1934. I understand that there are objections to some of the provisions of the Bill, as emerged from the Select Committee, and there must be enough time for this House to consider those changes. There is also another important Bill of a similar nature which has to be carried through in this House. In these circumstances I have pleasure in moving that the consideration of this Bill be adjourned till 1st February 1934."

Mr. A. V. BANOJI RAO:—"I second the motion."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The motion is that the consideration of the Madras Impartible Estates Act Amendment Bill (Bill No. 11 of 1932) be adjourned till 1st February 1934."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"Sir, I am surprised at the attitude taken by my hon. Friend, Mr. C. Basu Dev. I do not believe that it is with a view to enable another important Bill being carried through in this House that this Bill is sought to be adjourned. At the same time I would certainly tell my hon. Friends in this House that this Bill was before the Select Committee for a very long time and in considering the various aspects of this Bill opportunity was given to the zamindari Members of the Committee to put their case before the Committee. I am sure that my hon. Friends on the other side will not contradict me when I say that there was practical unanimity in the Committee and hon. Members representing zamindari interests had nothing to say against the Bill and it is with their full co-operation that this Bill has emerged from the Select Committee. If any other hon. Member of this House, other than those representing zamindari interests, were to object to the motion of my hon. Friend, Mr. Patnaik, I could understand it. I hope that the legislations brought forward by non-official Members of this House will not be treated in this manner by Members sitting on the Government Benches by means of dialatory motions with the ostensible object of allowing more time and all that, but really with the object of preventing the Bill from being passed into law."

\* The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"Sir, there is no intention of obstructing or delaying the Bill from being passed into law. For the last three or four days fresh amendments were given notice of and yesterday we wanted to have an opportunity of discussing them, and come to an understanding. But I was not well yesterday, and the Kumararaja of Venkatagiri also had fever last night, and we could not settle the matter. We have not had sufficient time to look through the fresh amendments that have been given notice of. I consulted the Leaders of all Parties and it is only with their concurrence that this motion is being moved."

\* Sriman M. G. PATNAIK Mahasayo:—"It is only just to come to an agreement regarding certain amendments that had been given notice

30th January 1934] [Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo]

of that we wanted to meet together. I had a talk with the Kumararaja of Venkatagiri. Of course as regards the report of the Select Committee, even some zamindars were dissatisfied."

The motion that the consideration of the Bill be adjourned till 1st February 1934 was put and carried.

### III.—THE MADRAS MONEY-LENDERS' BILL (BILL No. 21 OF 1932).

\* Mr. C. BASU DEV:—"I rise to present the Report <sup>a</sup> of the Select Committee on the Madras Money-lenders' Bill which I had the honour of introducing in the middle of July 1932 and move that the Bill, as amended by the Select Committee, be taken into consideration."

Mr. M. A. MUTHIAH CHETTIYAR:—"Sir, under Standing Order No. 43 which reads: 'that the Bill, as reported by the Select Committee be taken into consideration, but any member may object to its being so taken into consideration if the copies mentioned in Standing Order No. 41 have not been available for the use of Members for fifteen days', I object to this motion being made. Copies of this report were sent to us only on the 23rd and it is hardly seven days. The Report and the Bill should have been with us for fifteen days. I therefore object to the motion being made."

Mr. C. BASU DEV:—"I think that is a matter for which the Council Office is responsible."

Mr. M. A. MUTHIAH CHETTIYAR:—"I can only say this: it has nothing to do with the Council Office. The Committee met only in January between 8th and 10th and the hon. Member has given notice only on the 18th January and the Council Office has published it as quickly as it can. Therefore the Council Office is not to blame."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I think that no serious objection has been taken to my allowing the objection to-day. I hold that the motion need not be made now."

### IV.—THE MADRAS PUBLIC LIBRARIES BILL (BILL No. 11 OF 1933).

\* Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"I rise to present the Report <sup>b</sup> of the Select Committee on the Madras Public Libraries Bill and move that the Bill, as amended by the Select Committee, be taken into consideration."

"Sir, I find that there is some hesitancy on the part of the Government on the ground that they have not had enough time to consider the implications of the various provisions of the Bill, as amended by the Select Committee. There has already been a suggestion that they ought to have had time to consider the various amendments in their financial aspect and then come forward to support this Bill. I would

<sup>a</sup> Published in the Fort St. George Gazette on 16th January 1934.

<sup>b</sup> Printed as Appendix IV at pages 210-229 infra.



[Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed] [30th January 1934]

therefore merely make the motion that the Bill be taken into consideration and allow the Government or some one on their behalf to make the motion that the consideration of the Bill be adjourned to the next meeting of the Council."

S. M. K. BEYABANI SAHIB Bahadur:—"I second it."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"Mr. President, I beg to move—

*'that the consideration of this Bill be adjourned to a non-official day at the next meeting of the Council'."*

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT:—"I second it."

The hon. Sir MAHOMED USMAN:—"May I know what the hon. Member means by the next meeting of the Council?"

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The hon. Member probably refers to the meeting that will begin on the 21st February. That means that, if non-official days are not allotted for that meeting, the Bill will not be taken up at the meeting."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"My motion implies that, if non-official days are allotted for the next meeting, this Bill will be taken up for consideration then."

The hon. Sir MAHOMED USMAN:—"I have no objection."

Mr. R. MADANAGOPAL NAYUDU:—"Will not the same objection raised by Mr. Muthiah Chettiar to the Money-lenders' Bill apply to this Bill also?"

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"That question need not be raised now, because there is an agreement on another point."

The question that the consideration of the Bill be adjourned to a non-official day at the next meeting of the Council was put and carried.

V.—A BILL FURTHER TO AMEND THE MADRAS IMPARTIBLE ESTATES ACT, 1904, FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES (BILL No. 17 OF 1933).

Mr. A. V. BHANOJI RAO:—"Mr. President, Sir, I beg to present the Report<sup>a</sup> of the Select Committee on the Bill further to amend the Madras Impartible Estates Act, 1904, for certain purposes (Bill No. 17 of 1933) and move that the Bill, as amended by the Select Committee, be taken into consideration."

Mr. M. A. MUTHIAH CHETTIYAR:—"I second it."

Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"I rise merely to ask whether the conditions referred to by Mr. Muthiah Chettiar with regard to the Money-lenders' Bill, have been fulfilled in this case. If not, I object to the Bill being taken into consideration now."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"What holds good for another Bill must hold good for this Bill also and therefore I hold that this Bill cannot be taken up now."

30th January 1934]

VI.—A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS HINDU RELIGIOUS ENDOWMENTS ACT, 1926 (BILL No. 19 OF 1933).

\* Mr. P. V. KRISHNAYYA CHOUDARI:—" Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move—

*' that the Bill to amend the Madras Hindu Religious Endowments Act, 1926 (Bill No. 19<sup>a</sup> of 1933) be referred to a Select Committee.'*

In doing so, I want to say a few words. In ancient times, Hindu Rajas granted several inams to *archakas* for the performance of certain religious duties. If the *archakas* failed to discharge those duties, those inams were resumed and granted again to people who discharged those duties. After the advent of the British Government, the same rule is not observed. These inams have been converted into *seri* land and *pattas* have been granted to persons who were enjoying those lands. By this process, the temples which were benefited previously are not benefited now. The defaulters, that is, those who have failed to discharge the duties for which the inams were granted to them get all rights with regard to sale and mortgage of their inams by converting these lands into *seri*. The object of the Bill is to safeguard the interests of the temples and the properties which have been endowed to them by the ancient Rajas. That is the main principle of the Bill and I request hon. Members to accept my motion to refer this Bill to a Select Committee, so that this principle may be given effect to. I move that the following Members may constitute the Select Committee:—

Diwan Bahadur Sir Alladi Krishnaswami Ayyar.

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili.

The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell.

Rao Sahib P. Subrahmanyam Chetti.

Mr. G. Lakshmana Reddi.

Mr. G. Sriramulu.

Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu.

Mr. P. V. Krishnayya Choudari.

Mr. P. Peddiraju.

Mr. K. Singam Ayyangar.

Mr. A. B. Shetty.

Rao Bahadur D. Krishnamurti.

Rao Bahadur C. Natesa Mudaliyar.

Mr. K. Kesavaramamurti Nayudu.

Mr. K. Koti Reddi.

Mr. P. M. Thangal."

\* Mr. K. KOTI REDDI:—" Sir, I second the motion of my hon. Friend. I really do not think it is necessary to refer this Bill to a Select Committee, because there is a feeling in this country that already

[Mr. K. Koti Reddi]

[30th January 1934]

the matter has been delayed too long. But the hon. the Mover has thought it fit to refer the Bill to a Select Committee and I do not wish to say anything about it.

“With regard to the necessity for a Bill of this sort, there cannot be two opinions. The difficulty has arisen on account of a decision of the Privy Council with regard to inam lands to the effect that what was presumed to be conveyed in cases of such grants was the melvaram and not the kudivaram. On account of this decision, the Government have been granting pattas to alienees of temple property—inam lands. But it was not the intention of the grantors of these inam lands to archakas and other servants of the temple to grant only the melvaram. On account of this decision, inams which concern with the village economy, viz., artizan inams, i.e., inams granted to carpenters, washermen and potters have already in many places been alienated and the Government have granted the pattas to the alienees. In some places the Government grants the assessment to the man who performs the service. This has not helped the villagers much. The case is not so bad with regard to inams connected with temples. Somehow people have been under the impression that such inams cannot be alienated or mortgaged. Recently the impression is changed and a number of cases have occurred in which inams have been alienated or mortgaged with the result that the alienee gets the patta and the Government grants the assessment to the trustees of the temple to get the service performed. Property is thus lost to the temple. Whatever may be the value of the property, there is always a tendency to stick to it and make the best of it. It is certainly more valuable than the mere assessment fixed by the Government. Besides, it was never the intention of the grantors of these properties, as I have already pointed out, to grant anything less than the full title to property to the temple. The present practice is really an inroad on the rights of the temple and it is the result of the decision of the Privy Council. Though it is already late, I do not think it is too late. The time has come when such alienations ought to be prohibited altogether. If there is doubt with regard to the wisdom of the procedure proposed in the Bill, I am sure the Select Committee will go into the matter and amend it. I support the motion moved by my hon. Friend.”

\* The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—“Mr. President, I think I must oppose this motion. The object of this Bill is to provide that ‘in the absence of evidence to the contrary it shall be presumed that all devadayam inams, and inams granted for doing services in temples or maths are grants of both melvaram and kudivaram rights’ and certain other purposes. Sir, at the time of the inam settlement, the distinction between kudivaram and melvaram rights was recognized and all that the Government did in granting those inams was to grant their rights, that is to say, the melvaram rights. It is possible that in certain cases the inamdar might have possessed also the kudivaram right and in that case he would be in possession of both kudivaram and melvaram rights after receiving the inam from the Government. But



30th January 1934] [Sir Archibald Campbell]

unless he is in possession of the kudivaram right when the inam is made, he does not get that right. This Bill would have the effect of dispossessing the tenants of the inamdar who have the kudivaram right. It would be an expropriatory measure in favour of the inamdar and against the kudivaramdar and therefore I am bound to oppose this motion."

Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"Sir, the hon. the Revenue Member has opposed the Bill from one point of view, but he has not so far raised any objection to the real principle of the Bill. No doubt, the Bill, as drafted, is very wide in its scope and it might be considered to affect adversely the existing rights. The main principle of the Bill is this: there are a number of inams consisting of grants of both kudivaram and melvaram which were granted for the performance of certain services. If those services are not performed now and if a case for resumption of those inams is made out, the Government may resume those inams and add them to the property of the temple, so that they may be granted again to persons who perform those services for which the inams were originally granted. That is the main object of the Bill. If the Bill goes to the Select Committee it will be possible to protect the interests of those on whom titles have been conferred. The Government may be in a position to resume certain inams in order to protect the property of the temple and grant them to persons who may be appointed to perform the services in future. Under these circumstances, I think the hon. the Revenue Member will see his way to let the Bill go to the Select Committee so that the objections that he has urged might be removed and necessary safeguards provided by way of exceptions to the general principle of the Bill. So that in future where a case has been made out for the resumption of an inam consisting of both the kudivaram and the melvaram, the resumption might operate in favour of the temple and in favour of the holder of the office who may be doing the services for which the inam was originally granted."

Mr. DEVADASAN:—"I move that Standing Order No. 39 (2) be suspended and that the following Members be added to the Select Committee."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The hon. Member may wait till the discussion on this motion is finished. There is opposition raised to the motion itself."

\* Mr. T. C. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"As my hon. Friend, Mr. Muniswami Nayudu, said, there will no doubt be an opportunity in the Select Committee to set right the difficulties. However, I should not omit to raise my objection to the statement made by the Seconder of this motion that in all cases where an inam has been granted, it is only the melvaram that has been granted and not the kudivaram. I know of innumerable cases in districts south of Madras, cases of inams held by Mussalmans as well as Hindus, where both the varams have

[Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar] [30th January 1934]

11-45 a.m. been granted. If they own not only the kudivaram but also the melvaram rights, they cultivate the land either themselves or through others. Except in the case of shares of big villages or whole villages, both kudivaram and melvaram rights are held by the archakas or pattars as they are called in our part of the country. To say that in every case only melvaram was given as emoluments for the services rendered, will not be correct. The Select Committee will have to go into the matter with care so that vested rights are not interfered with and the temple's rights are protected."

\* Sriman M. G. PATNAIK Mahasayo:—"Sir, with regard to these minor inams, the presumption is that both the kudivaram and the melvaram rights are granted. There is absolutely no reason why any distinction should be made between kudivaram and melvaram so far as these minor inams are concerned. Of course, the Bill refers to both the kudivaram and melvaram rights. It is simply to show that the entire right should go to the new office-holder and not be retained by the person who held the land previously. No interest in the land should remain with the person dismissed from service. It should go to the person who is newly appointed. It is only with that intention that the words both 'kudivaram and melvaram' are found in the Bill. I do not think we need go into the question at all with regard to these minor inams. As has been suggested, the matter might be gone into at the Select Committee stage."

\* Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. PATRO:—"Sir, I have not the advantage of listening to the hon. Member opposing this motion. But from the facts it is quite clear that the minor inamdars have both the rights. It will be hard to deprive them of those rights. In the case of temples, minor inams are granted to the temples themselves. Both melvaram and kudivaram rights are granted in these cases. If the land is resumed, then both the rights will be vested in the temple itself. Therefore it stands to reason that, whenever the inam is again granted to another person, the temple or the institution can give the right to the person succeeding. If the present occupant is dismissed or is deprived of the right, then it will vest in the temple and the temple will have the right to give it to the person who succeeds to the office. It is but right and just that this matter should be considered in the Select Committee."

\* Mr. M. DEVADASAN:—"Sir, I move that Standing Order No. 39 (2) be suspended and the following names be added to the list of Select Committee Members:—

- (1) Mr. R. Madanagopal Nayudu.
- (2) Rao Sahib C. Jayaram Nayudu.
- (3) Mr. H. M. Jagannatham.
- (4) Swami A. S. Sahajanandam.
- (5) Mr. V. P. Narayanan Nambiyar.
- (6) Mr. M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar.

30th January 1934] [Mr. M. Devadasan]

This is an important Bill and it is necessary that these persons should be on the Select Committee."

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—"Sir, I am afraid that even on short Bills it seems to have become the practice on the floor of this House to introduce a number of Members after the decision is come to between Leaders of Parties and the names have been suggested. I know that it has been the complaint of the Finance Department that the travelling allowance bill of the Legislative Council is going up because Members seem to desire to be on every Select Committee that can possibly be appointed by this House. I should deprecate hon. Members who are not Leaders of Parties getting up and suggesting names for being included in the Select Committee. I hope hon. Members will have the responsibility to realize that we are here as responsible representatives of the people of the Province and we ought to be as careful about spending the money of the tax-payer as the Government themselves are."

\* Mr. M. DEVADASAN:—"I want to offer a personal explanation, Sir. My hon. Friend, Mr. Subbarayan, observed that motions are made without the Members feeling their responsibility. But I have to say that I moved this motion only with the consent of the majority of the Members of the Party of which I am a Member and he is not justified in making such observations."

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—"Sir, may I ask whether he has the permission of the hon. the Raja of Bobbili who is supposed to lead the party behind him?"

\* Mr. M. DEVADASAN:—"I made this motion, Sir, at the instance of the Whip of the Party of which I am a member."

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—"Sir, may I ask again whether the Chief Whip has taken the permission of his Leader?"

\* The hon. Sir MAHOMED USMAN:—"May I appeal to the hon. Member to withdraw his motion?"

\* Mr. M. DEVADASAN:—"In view of the appeal made by the hon. the Leader of the House, I withdraw my motion."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The question is that the Bill to amend the Madras Hindu Religious Endowments Act, 1926 (Bill No. 19 of 1933) be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the names proposed."

The motion was declared lost.

A poll was demanded and the House divided thus:—

Ayes.

- 1 Mr. P. Bayappa Reddi.
- 2 " G. Lakshmana Reddi.
- 3 " M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar.
- 4 " A. V. Bhanaji Rao.
- 5 " K. M. Duraiswami Reddiyar.
- 6 " H. M. Jagannatham.
- 7 Rao Bahadur D. Krishnamurti.

- 8 Rao Sahib P. Subrahmanyam Chetti.
- 9 " D. V. Narasimhaswami.
- 10 Rao Sahib Pandit Ganala Ramamurti.
- 11 Mr. K. Kesavaramamurti Nayudu.
- 12 " J. A. Davis.
- 13 Dr. P. Subbarayan.



[30th January 1934

*Ayes—cont.*

- |                                        |                                      |
|----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 14 Mr. K. R. Venkatarama Ayyar.        | 28 Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabha-   |
| 15 Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar.       | pati Mudaliyar.                      |
| 16 Khan Bahadur Mahmud Schamnad        | 29 Mr. M. S. Sreshtha.               |
| Sahib Bahadur.                         | 30 „ P. V. Krishnayya Choudari.      |
| 17 Mr. A. B. Shetty.                   | 31 Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo.    |
| 18 Khan Bahadur P. Khalif-ul-lah Sahib | 32 Diwan Bahadur M. Gopalaswami      |
| Bahadur.                               | Mudaliyar.                           |
| 19 Rao Bahadur P. C. Muthu Chettiyar.  | 33 Mr. C. Indrayya.                  |
| 20 Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan.              | 34 „ J. Kuppuswami Choudari.         |
| 21 Basheer Ahmed Sayeed Sahib Baha-    | 35 „ G. R. Premayya.                 |
| dur.                                   | 36 „ P. Madhusudanan Thangal.        |
| 22 Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt.        | 37 Rao Bahadur R. K. Venugopal       |
| 23 „ K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder.         | Nayudu.                              |
| 24 „ P. Peddi Raju.                    | 38 Mr. O. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar. |
| 25 „ K. Singam Ayyangar.               | 39 „ K. Koti Reddi.                  |
| 26 Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami          | 40 Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro.      |
| Nayudu.                                | 41 „ C. Natesa Mudaliyar.            |
| 27 Mr. K. P. Raman Menon.              | 42 Mr. V. P. Narayanan Nambiyar.     |

*Noes.*

- |                                  |                                      |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1 The hon. Sir Mahomed Usman.    | 17 Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa      |
| 2 „ Diwan Bahadur Sir M.         | Bahadur.                             |
| Krishnan Nayar.                  | 18 Rao Bahadur R. Srinivasan.        |
| 3 „ Sir Archibald Campbell.      | 19 Mr. M. Vedachala Mudaliyar.       |
| 4 „ Sir Hopetoun Stokes.         | 20 „ B. P. Sessa Reddi.              |
| 5 „ Diwan Bahadur S. Kuma-       | 21 „ P. C. Moses.                    |
| raswami Reddiyar.                | 22 „ P. V. Rajagopal Pillai.         |
| 6 „ Mr. P. T. Rajan.             | 23 „ V. G. Vasudeva Pillai.          |
| 7 „ the Raja of Bobbili.         | 24 Rao Sahib V. Dharmalingam Pillai. |
| 8 Diwan Bahadur V. N. Viswanatha | 25 Raja of Khallikote.               |
| Rao.                             | 26 Zamindar of Kirlampudi.           |
| 9 Mr. J. A. Thorne.              | 27 Diwan Bahadur A. Appadurai        |
| 10 „ H. M. Hood.                 | Pillai.                              |
| 11 Diwan Bahadur N. Gopalaswami  | 28 S. M. K. Beyabani Sahib Bahadur.  |
| Ayyangar.                        | 29 Diwan Bahadur S. Ellappa Chetti-  |
| 12 Mr. R. Madanagopal Nayudu.    | yar.                                 |
| 13 „ E. Conran Smith.            | 30 Mr. C. Basu Dev.                  |
| 14 „ M. D. T. Ranganatha Mudali- | 31 „ R. M. Palat.                    |
| yar.                             | 32 „ C. Krishnan.                    |
| 15 Mr. T. Narasa Reddi.          |                                      |
| 16 Rao Sahib N. Siva Raj.        |                                      |

*Neutral.*

- |                                   |                                  |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1 Rao Bahadur G. Jagannatha Raju. | 9 Mr. M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar. |
| 2 Mrs. K. Alamelumangathayaramma. | 10 „ M. B. Rangaswami Reddi.     |
| 3 Khan Bahadur Yahya Ali Sahib    | 11 „ F. Birley.                  |
| Bahadur.                          | 12 „ J. K. Metherell.            |
| 4 Mr. M. Devadasan.               | 13 „ W. K. M. Langley.           |
| 5 „ G. Sriramulu.                 | 14 „ W. W. Ladden.               |
| 6 „ W. P. A. Soundara Pandian.    | 15 „ W. H. Millar.               |
| 7 „ Daniel Thomas.                | 16 „ G. Simhachalam.             |
| 8 „ V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar.    |                                  |

*Ayes 42. Noes 32. Neutral 16.*

The motion was carried.

VII.—THE MADRAS MATERNITY BENEFIT BILL (BILL No. 10 OF 1933).

\* Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—“ Mr. President, I move—  
‘ that the Madras Maternity Bill (Bill No. 10 <sup>a</sup> of 1933) be referred  
to a Select Committee.’

<sup>a</sup> Published in the Fort St. George Gazette on 15th August 1933.

30th January 1934] [Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar]

"In doing so, I have got only a few observations to make. I may say at once that this is the first attempt that this Council is making in the matter of labour legislation in this Presidency. I may also say that similar statutes are in force in some of the major Provinces of India such as Bombay, the Central Provinces and others. This attempt is a very modest one, and the necessity for such legislation has been felt not only in this Presidency but throughout the country; and in fact, in several Provinces such legislation is already on the Statute Book. The attempt in this Bill is to provide for certain compensation to be paid to women workers who are engaged in factory labour for a few weeks before their period of confinement and for a few weeks after that. I do not claim for my Bill any finality on the question of compensation or on the question of the period for which compensation has to be paid to the woman worker by her employer. As I said, it is a very modest attempt, and for the information of hon. Members of this House, I may also say this is one of those measures which the Royal Commission on Labour who visited this country two years ago recommended for adoption as a uniform standard throughout the length and breadth of India. As other Provinces have tackled this question and have placed this question of compensation to be paid to women workers on the Statute Books, in the absence of a similar provision in this Presidency, I think this Bill is necessary. At the same time I may say that so far as I have known—I am connected with a large number of trade unions in this Presidency—every trade union organization has placed this as one of the social services which the State, or in the absence of the State, the employers of labour, have to undertake. I have therefore great pleasure in moving that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following Members:—

The hon. Sir Mahomed Usman.  
 Diwan Bahadur N. Gopalaswami Ayyangar.  
 Rao Sahib D. V. Narasimhaswami.  
 Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt.  
 Rao Bahadur C. Natesa Mudaliyar.  
 Mrs. K. Alamelumangathayaramma.  
 Rao Sahib V. I. Muniswami Pillai.  
 Rao Sahib P. Subrahmanyam Chetti.  
 Mr. P. C. Moses.  
 Mr. C. Basu Dev.  
 Rao Sahib Pandit Ganala Ramamurti.  
 Mr. M. B. Rangaswami Reddi.  
 Mr. M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar.  
 Mr. C. Indrayya.  
 Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder.  
 Mr. J. K. Metherell.  
 Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar (the Mover).

"I may add, Sir, that in connexion with the introduction of this Bill, I have received considerable help at the hands of the hon. the Home Member who is in charge of the Labour portfolio of this Presidency and his able Secretary, Diwan Bahadur N. Gopalaswami Ayyangar. I hope, Sir, that they will think it fit to accept this modest

[Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar] [30th January 1934]

venture in the light of labour legislation in other Provinces and make this Bill a precursor of the labour legislation in this Presidency."

\* Mr. C. BASU DEV:—"Sir, I have great pleasure in seconding this motion. I do not think I need make any speech, as the hon. Mover has already covered all the important points."

\* The hon. Sir MAHOMED USMAN:—"Sir, the attitude of the Government in regard to this Bill is one of general sympathy; but it requires improvement in many directions, and that will be considered at the Select Committee stage."

Mrs. K. ALAMELUMANGATHAYARAMMA spoke in Tamil supporting the motion, and the following is the English translation of her speech:—

"Mr. President, Sir, the Bill brought in by Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar is an important measure. I myself intended to introduce in this Council a Bill of this nature: but I am glad that this Bill has been brought in by another Member of this Council. It shows how our public men are interested in the welfare of women, particularly of the labouring classes. The Bill proposes that poor working women in various factories and in other places of manual labour who are in a state of pregnancy, should be given leave with full wages for some weeks before and after childbirth. At present sheer poverty compels them to work till the last moment of delivery. Their condition is indeed most pitiable. Similar provision is made for women of working classes in most civilized countries. I am fully in sympathy with the measure and I support it most heartily. I request other Members of this Council to support this Bill and trust that Government will also help to place this Bill on the Statute Book."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"Mr. President, Sir, Dr. Subbarayan, the Leader of this Party, on a former occasion laid down a certain principle with regard to the selection of Members of the Select Committee to which any Bill may be referred. If any non-official Gentleman who introduced a Bill proposed names of Members of the Select Committee, I thought that he would do so after consulting the Leaders of various Parties. In this case, I am afraid my hon. Friend, Mr. Ramaswami Mudaliyar, has evidently not consulted either the Leader or the Chief Whip of the Opposition. He has included names, I suppose, in his own way and as he liked; and it is only on occasions like this that there is a necessity for hon. Members from various sides to ask for the suspension of the Standing Order with the consequent result that the list becomes very large and the number goes beyond a certain limit. In order to avoid any necessity on the part of hon. Members to ask for such suspension of the Standing Order, it is better, I would suggest, that the hon. Member who moves the Bill always consults the Leaders of various Parties before getting up to read the names of Members of the Select Committee."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"Sir, on a point of personal explanation, I may tell my Friend, Mr. Hameed Khan, that I have consulted, so far as his Party is concerned, the Leader of his Party.



30th January 1934] [Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar]

I have also consulted the official Member in charge of this subject in regard to that matter; and I have further consulted the Chief Whip of the Justice Party and Mr. Krishnayya Choudari with regard to the names. I tried my level best, Sir, to accommodate all points of view on the Select Committee. It is not my intention, and it will never be my intention, to shut out any point of view on a Bill of this nature which, I hope, will be made a non-party question."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The question is that the Madras Maternity Benefit Bill (Bill No. 10 of 1933) be referred to a Select Committee, consisting of Members whose names have already been read out."

The motion was carried.

A BILL TO AMEND THE ANDHRA UNIVERSITY ACT, 1925, AS AMENDED BY ACT VI OF 1929 (BILL No. 18 OF 1933).

Rao Sahib D. V. Narasimhaswami who had given notice to move a motion that the above Bill be referred to a Select Committee was not in his place when called by the hon. the President.

VIII.—A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS HINDU RELIGIOUS ENDOWMENTS ACT, 1926.

Mr. K. KOTI REDDI:—"Mr. President, Sir, I move for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Madras Hindu Religious Endowments Act, 1926."

Mr. A. B. SHETTY:—"I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

Mr. K. KOTI REDDI:—"I introduce the Bill."

IX.—THE MADRAS MUSLIM WAKF BILL.

S. M. K. BEYABANI SAHIB Bahadur:—"Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce the Madras Muslim Wakf Bill."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

S. M. K. BEYABANI SAHIB Bahadur:—"I introduce the Bill."

A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS HINDU RELIGIOUS ENDOWMENTS ACT, 1926.

Rao Sahib N. Siva Raj who had given notice to ask for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Madras Hindu Religious Endowments Act, 1926, was not in his place when called by the hon. the President.

X.—A BILL FURTHER TO AMEND THE MADRAS LOCAL BOARDS ACT, 1920.

Mr. P. C. MOSES:—"Mr. President, I move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920."

Mr. DANIEL THOMAS:—"I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

Mr. P. C. MOSES:—"I introduce the Bill."

[30th January 1934]

## THE MADRAS DEBT CONCILIATION BILL.

Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar who had given notice to ask for leave to introduce the Madras Debt Conciliation Bill was not in his place when called by the hon. the President.

## XI.—ELECTION OF A MEMBER TO THE FINANCE COMMITTEE FOR 1933-34.

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I have to announce that Mr. J. K. Metherell is the only candidate nominated for election to the Finance Committee. As the number of vacancies is one, I hereby declare him duly elected to the Finance Committee."

## XII.—RESOLUTION ON A MATTER OF GENERAL PUBLIC INTEREST—REMISSION OF THE EXISTING RATE OF ASSESSMENT IN RYOTWARI LANDS IN THE PRESIDENCY.

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The House will now pass on to the resolutions. On the last non-official day, the House was discussing the following resolution of Mr. Arasu and the amendments thereto, viz.:—

*Resolution.*

*'This Council recommends to the Government that a remission of 25 per cent in the existing rate of assessment on ryotwari lands in the Presidency be granted during fasli 1343.'*

*Amendment of Mr. P. V. Krishnayya Choudari.*

- (1) 'Add at the end the words "and that the remaining assessment on lands be collected in kind and not in money".'

*Amendment of Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed.*

- (2) 'After the words "assessment" and before the words "or ryotwari," insert the words "inclusive of water-cess and other cesses".'

"Further discussion of the resolution and the amendments will now continue."

12-15  
p.m.

\* Mr. K. R. VENKATARAMA AYYAR:—"Mr. President, Sir, this resolution was being discussed last time and when the discussion reached a certain stage, it was found that it might be an advantage if the discussion stood adjourned in view of the general expectation that the subject was one which had sufficiently arrested the attention of the Government and was likely to command sympathetic treatment at the hands of the Government. As orders of Government were expected and there was very good reason to anticipate that these orders might go a long way and give general satisfaction to the people concerned, it was thought that there was not much to be gained by pressing forward with the discussion when there was that expectation. Orders have no doubt since issued, but have those orders satisfied the expectations of the public or the requirements of the situation with which we are face to face? That is the question. Although it is impossible to get the Government to assent precisely to what the representatives of the people might demand on the floor of this House, it must be said that it should have been possible for the Government to go forward farther than they have done, and the ryots concerned all over the Presidency are now feeling

30th January 1934] [Mr. K. R. Venkatarama Ayyar]

considerable disappointment at the scanty relief which alone has been vouchsafed by the Government in their order.

"The resolution as moved on the floor of this House asks for a 25 per cent remission. In so far as the amendment has included water-cess and other cesses, I think it would be found at the end of the discussion that the general view of all the representatives of the people in this House would be in support of that amendment, because whatever remission is wanted is wanted not only in respect of the ryotwari assessment proper but also in respect of the water and other cesses. As for the precise percentage, which would be a fair percentage to remit, although the Government have not seen their way to remit or even suspend anything like 25 per cent, and although the Government have not even seen their way to adopt in toto the recommendations of the Finance Committee, it must be said that so far as the members of this House are concerned, there is good justification for them to urge that what would meet the requirements of the situation would be, not even a 25 per cent remission, but if possible a higher percentage. In view of the devastation by cyclone and floods in portions of the Presidency, it must be said that there is very good justification if only Government could manage to allow as much as 50 per cent remission. But, we the members of this House are not unaware of the impracticability of pressing forward excessive demands. Judging from the view-point of the ryots concerned, of what is barely just and strictly necessary to give them adequate relief, a 50 per cent reduction is equitable and absolutely necessary. But as Government has to be run and as notwithstanding the existing surplus amounts that are available as much as a 50 per cent reduction may not be feasible, I think it would really be not too much to stress that Government should in any case agree at least to a remission—not merely a suspension of 25 per cent.

"Meetings have been held all over the Presidency, not simply in certain districts but in all the districts, and the affected ryot population have passed unanimous resolutions asking for a 50 per cent reduction, 33-1/3 per cent reduction and in some cases 25 per cent reduction. The Government have been duly informed from all over the Presidency of these resolutions. Conferences have been held almost everywhere and at the top of all these district, village and taluk conferences, there was a conference of the ryotwari landholders held in Madras quite recently on the 27th. On that occasion, the opinion of the ryotwari landholders of the whole Presidency was focussed and a strong case was made out for a remission of at least 33-1/3 per cent. I think, Sir, this is a case in which it is not as if we are going to enlighten the Government with new facts and figures. It is quite clear that Government is in possession of all the data requisite and it is only a question of how far Government is willing to put its hands upon the available surplus moneys and to adjust its policy in various directions in order to give the ryot population this much needed relief. After all the ryotwari population, who constitute the bulk of the population of this Presidency, are the mainstay of the Government and at the present time what with



[Mr. K. R. Venkatarama Ayyar]

[30th January 1934]

agricultural indebtedness and the total volume of it, what with the continued low prices of agricultural products, what with the disturbance caused by the cyclone, floods and other abnormal happenings, Government has certainly to make up its mind to explore all ways of giving the ryot this much-needed relief. After all it has got to keep the ryots in possession of the lands in order that it may make out of the lands of the ryot population the revenue which you for all time expect to obtain from this main source of income. You cannot drive them off the land and yet think of land revenue. If you will only think of it from that aspect, I think you will feel constrained to grant that, as the present is an exceptional occasion, exceptional concessions must be the way of the Government in tackling the problem. It is not suggested at all that what may now be adopted by Government as an exceptional measure has for all time to be continued. No doubt, the question of land revenue and the principles of land revenue assessment require to be gone into with thoroughness and care and the whole subject has got to be rested upon an equitable and statutory basis. But that perhaps will be one of the first topics that will engage the attention of the new legislature under the Reformed Constitution. Meanwhile, all that is suggested is that as the present is an exceptional occasion, exceptional remedy should be resorted to in a sympathetic spirit by the Government not only from the point of view of the ryots but also from the selfish point of view of the Government itself because Government has to keep the land in the possession of the landholder in order to ensure a continuance of the land revenue as its main source of income. Unless therefore a reduction of at least 25 per cent, not only of the ryotwari assessment but also of water-cess and other cesses is agreed to on the present occasion, it will really be impossible for the landholders to continue in possession of the land and for the Government to make anything out of this important source of revenue.

"I therefore, without at all attempting to embarrass the position of Government, beg to suggest to them that they should go much farther than they have done in their recent orders. There was not sufficient reason for them to depart from the recommendation of the Finance Committee. Even if they went so far as the Finance Committee went, it would not really do. They should at least go forward further and agree to a 25 per cent reduction during this fasli—it should not be a case of mere suspension, because nothing is to be gained by allowing these arrears to accumulate, so that the Government might think of collecting them in the next year's demands from these over-burdened ryots. I would ask therefore that the whole matter should be reconsidered by the Government in a sympathetic spirit and that 25 per cent at least be remitted and not merely suspended."

\* MR. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"Mr. President, on the last occasion, I spoke on my amendment, but not on the main motion."

\* THE HON. THE PRESIDENT:—"I think the hon. Member has spoken on the main motion also last time."

30th January 1934]

\* Mr. R. M. PALAT:—"Sir, this question of the enhancement of assessment has been agitating us in Malabar for some time. It is well-known that in the Native States of Travancore and Cochin, where conditions are identical and which adjoin British Malabar, remissions of 12½ per cent in some cases and more in other cases have been made from the main or old assessment, while in British Malabar the remission has been made from the enhanced rates only although the old assessment in Malabar was considerably higher than that in the States. Again a flat rate of 12½ per cent remission on the enhanced rates has been given throughout Malabar irrespective of the area so that the remission varies from place to place as only certain taluks have been settled, or in the alternative there has been no remission where there has been no enhancement. Government will say that as the financial systems of the Native States and of our Government are different, they are justified in following different rules as regards remission. My reply to it would be that in that case, the sooner the British system is scrapped and the Native State system is adopted the better, because the Native States are able to carry on their Government efficiently and cheaply and with less burden to the people than our Government in British Malabar. There have been remissions not only on the West Coast, but we also find them in Mysore and Hyderabad. Sir, the whole of the present settlement has been based on the assumption of a rise in prices but Mr. Bajpai has made a statement on behalf of the Government in the Assembly that the price of paddy has sunk to one-third of what it was a few years ago. This admission practically cuts away the ground from under the feet of the present attitude of the Government; the only justification even according to our Government settlement rules for any enhancement of revenue is enhanced prices.

"Sir, Mr. Thorne, who is present here and who was manager for 12-30 some time of the Zamorin's Estate will tell you that it was with the p.m. greatest difficulty that he was able to get his own pay during the period of kist collection. Therefore, if this was the case in spite of his excellent management, how then could he, or the Government expect the more or less uneducated and untrained and happy-go-lucky janmi in Malabar to pay his assessment? Then, there is this bogey always brought before us that if we ask you to make any remission in our assessment, we cannot have any grants for Local Self-Government or any nation-building departments. We must, first of all, live before having anything to do with nation-building. First of all, the body must be there before we try to build the body. The Government seem to lay more stress on body-building than the existence of the body itself. Then, there was a statement made by the hon. Sir Archibald Campbell with regard to the introduction of ryotwari settlement in Malabar. I will only read from page 576 of the Fifth report; the statement of Mr. Thackeray:—

'This equality of condition, in respect to wealth in land; this general distribution of the soil among a yeomanry, therefore, if it be not most adapted to agricultural improvement, is best adapted to attain improvement, in the state of property, manners and institutions, which prevail in India; and it will be found still more adapted to the situation of the country, governed by a few strangers, where pride, high ideas, and ambitious thoughts, must be stifled. It is

[Mr. R. M. Palat]

[30th January 1934]

very proper, that in England, a good share of the produce of the earth should be appropriated to support certain families in affluence, to produce senators, sages, and heroes for the service and defence of the State, or, in other words, that great part of the rent should go to an opulent nobility and gentry, who are to serve their country in Parliament, in the army and navy, in the departments of science and liberal professions. The leisure, independence, and high ideas, which the enjoyment of this rent affords, has enabled them to raise Britain to the pinnacle of glory. Long may they enjoy it; but in India that haughty spirit, independence, and deep thought, which the possession of great wealth sometimes gives, ought to be suppressed. They are directly adverse to our power and interest. The nature of things, the past experience of all governments, renders it unnecessary to enlarge on this subject. We do not want generals, statesmen, and legislators; we want industrious husbandmen.

"I do not want to read the whole, but am confining myself to what is applicable to the principles of settlement. These were the motives that induced the Government in those days. But now, since the reforms, I would say, and I want to make this quite clear, that those motives cannot, in my opinion ought not, now be adduced. After the reforms, the whole spirit has changed, or ought to have changed, as India is to be taken into partnership. What might have affected the settlement of the Presidency in those days, should not in any way be the motive at present. Therefore, I would request the Government again to reconsider the question. While urging that this 25 per cent remission on the main assessment should be possible and acceptable to Government, I must state our disappointment that they have not agreed even to the Finance Committee's recommendation of a modest reduction of 18 $\frac{3}{4}$  per cent of the enhanced and not the main rate. The revenue lost to Government by a remission of assessment can be met by a reduction of pay of the establishment. The pay was raised during the years of war on the ground of the increase in prices and in the cost of living. The prices have fallen according to Mr. Bajpai and so the cost of living also would have gone down. There is no reason whatever why the pay of the Imperial Services and all services throughout India should be kept up at the increased level and should not be reduced. We had a proposal yesterday to get the number of taluk boards reduced. It was then calmly accepted by the Government that a number of the taluk board employees would be thrown out of employment. If local board employees could be thrown out of employment, then why not Government employees also both Imperial and Provincial? To me, Sir, the pledge of the Madras Government is as good as that of the Imperial Government or of the Secretary of State. Is it only a certain class of people alone that can bear the reduction? It stands to reason that all classes of people in the services can bear the same reduction both in their numbers and their rates of pay. The Imperial Services and local services are only names and arrangements made for the convenience of administration. There is very little difference in the essential principle of security of employment. So, Sir, to make up any money that would be required by remission, we could first of all impose a drastic reduction of salaries. We could also impose income-tax on pensions and pays drawn outside India, from Indian revenues. It is a generally accepted principle, Sir, except in India, that if any money is drawn from a country by persons resident outside the country, the country



30th January 1934] [Mr. R. M. Palat]

from which the money is drawn is always entitled to impose an income-tax. I am not a financial expert; but these are a few sources that occur to me, which, with other means our Finance Member ought to be able to place before you, would be enough to make up for any reduction in land revenue assessment."

\* Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. PATRO:—"On a matter like this, I am surprised to see that the benches on both sides are so sparsely populated. The attendance is very poor for the beginning. The interest on behalf of the poor cultivating ryot is manifested by the very little attention given to this very important subject. That shows that whatever one may talk outside when it comes to the solution of the problem and practical solution we have not been able to contribute anything to the ryot or the cultivator. From that preliminary remark, I may pass on and submit to the House that it is very easy to be popular by asking people not to pay taxes or to pay reduced taxation. But to say that you should pay higher tax or continue to pay what you have been paying is really very unpopular. By my position will be not to be influenced one way or other but to speak as an agriculturist and a landlord. Having responsibility of management of my lands, I am aware of the great blow that the landholders and cultivators have received on account of the present economic depression. There was a time when a garce of paddy was sold at Rs. 100 or 120; now the same quantity is sold at Rs. 40 to 42, and there is not even sufficient demand for this price. This has been so for the last two years. At the same time, we should remember that during past years landholders as well as agriculturists have had bumper crops, as it were, selling paddy at Rs. 110 and 120 for garce. From that time unnecessary luxuries were contracted and the standard of living was much raised. It is impossible now to maintain that standard under the present strained circumstances. Therefore, we should ask that the demand of land revenue may be reduced and that we need not pay for carrying the administration as we were paying before. This aspect of the question is not solely confined to this Province or India, but it is wide-spread all over the world. It is a world depression. As suggested by another speaker it should be considered not from the point of view of taluk or district, but from the point of view of the whole administration. The question being one of economic depression, are you prepared at present to stop all development in the administration? If you are prepared to say here in this Council that those Members of Government who adorn the Government Benches are merely there to mark time and do nothing for the advancement of the people, then of course there is justification in the very vehement remarks of my hon. Friend from Madura that not only 25 but even 33½ per cent should be remitted. On the other hand, we want the administration to be run on proper lines for the benefit of the people for which we are here and for which the hon. Members are also there. If anything has to be done to the people, is it fair to ask that one-third of the revenue of the Province should be cut down and yet the standard of efficiency and good administration should be maintained? How is it possible that both could be done at the same time? As hon. Members are aware, investments were made

[Sir A. P. Patro]

[30th January 1934]

not by those who cultivate the lands, but by capitalists and money-lenders as lawyers and others. Hon. Members would also note that investors in coffee, rubber and various other concerns are also hard hit. Similarly with regard to investments in banks. Bank-rates were reduced from  $5\frac{1}{2}$  to even 2 per cent. The investments in the Imperial Bank and other banks have also suffered in that way by the interest being reduced because there is no demand for the money from the banks. Thus, this is a point to be considered not from the point of view of electors and elections, but from the point of view of justice to the taxpayer, namely, is it possible that investments which yielded a favourable rate could now be expected to yield the same rate? Is it fair on the part of those that have invested money in land to claim a reduction as of necessity? Why then, when you, the mirasidars, purchased the lands and don't cultivate them yourselves, why do you want to profit yourself in the name of the economic depression? The economic depression has affected not one single class of people; it affects all classes of people. The capitalists and big landholders are most vociferous and loud in their protest. But what about the poor man? I cannot understand how the reduction meets the needs of the situation. It goes to the benefit of the big pattadars. What has the Government done for the sake of the poor man? If they had considered the remission in the case of those who pay less than 10 rupees, if they take up courage in their hands and say, "We are going to benefit the cultivating ryot, who toils and earns his own livelihood himself with his family. Relief goes to such a person," then, it will be an act of kindness on the part of the Government to the actual sufferer. But, Government have reduced  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per cent in the case of those districts where resettlement was made.

12-45  
p.m.

"It is benefiting the big pattadars, the idle pattadars and the pattadars who have made money as money-lenders. It does not at all benefit the poor pattadars. If remission had been made entirely in the case of the poor ten-rupee pattadars, it can be said to be a very necessary thing. Take the case of concession in the income-tax. Then, Sir, what is the idea underlying this remission? Is it the case that the prices are low and therefore this remission is necessary? The poor cultivators borrow money at high rates of interest from the big landholders and are in course of time swallowed up by the latter. How does this relief help them? This should be realized by the Government.

"From another point of view also, I should say, the communiqué issued by the Government explaining their land revenue policy, must convince every one that it is impossible for them to do more than what they have done. The communiqué effectively answers all the arguments that the basic principle of resettlement should be altered altogether. Those arguments really mean a complete revolution in the revenue policy of the Government. That reversal of the policy may take place after the popular Government comes in. When there is the popular element on the Treasury Benches, you will have opportunities of changing the land revenue policy and adjusting other demands on the Government. But at present it is impossible to change the resettlement policy. To talk of basic principles on which the assessment is levied in this

30th January 1934]

[Sir A. P. Patro]

Presidency is all right. What is wrong with it nobody has shown. Mr. Palat asked, when it is possible for Mysore and Hyderabad to remit a large percentage of their land revenue, why is it not possible for the Madras Government to do likewise. I do not defend the Madras Government at all; but what I do say is that you should know the large amounts that are budgeted every year in our province for expenditure on development departments. I have looked into the budgets of two Indian States and on a comparison with them I find that there is no analogy. It is possible for them to show a higher percentage of remission. It is no good bringing in the conditions obtaining in Native States for comparison with ours."

Mr. R. M. PALAT:—"On a point of order, Sir. I had not in my mind those considerations at all."

\* Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. PATRO:—"I am only pointing out that the analogy of the Native States is not correct."

"Then again it is said that the revenue policy of the Government should be radically altered so as to effect a change in the method of classification. The critics forget in this connexion that in the resettlements there is no reclassification of the soils. What is done at resettlements is to note any rise in prices."

Mr. R. M. PALAT:—"There has been reclassification."

\* Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. PATRO:—"During resettlement they have only fixed up the tarams, noted the rise in prices and settled the increment not exceeding  $18\frac{3}{4}$  per cent. That being the case, it is wrong to say that the basic principle should be altered immediately. It has been a surprise to me to find no practical suggestion emanating from the critics though there is no dearth of criticism of the land revenue policy. Nobody has suggested in what manner that policy could be changed. I therefore say that it is not fair that the Government should give a uniform rate of  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per cent remission for all people. As a tax-payer I feel that I have to pay for the sake of the big landholders. I do not want that the Government should mulct me and benefit the rich landholder. What the Government should do is this: they should take up the question whether they could give relief to the ten-rupee pattadar. That would be a wise thing to do to relieve the distressed condition of the poor people. Such action would really help the actual cultivator. To my mind there is no justification for any other proposal. I do not see any justification for saying that 25 per cent or  $33\frac{1}{3}$  per cent of the taxes should be remitted as suggested."

\* Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT:—"Mr. President, had it not been for the two or three statements made by the hon. Member, Sir Patro, I should never have risen to speak in support of this motion which is sure to get the unanimous support of this House."

"In the first place my hon. Friend stated that Mr. Palat was wrong in stating that, because remission was granted in Cochin and Travancore, remission should be given to Malabar also. I say, Sir, Sir Patro has not understood the proposition put forward by Mr. Palat. I may



[Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt] [30th January 1934]

at once say that the rate of assessment in Cochin and Travancore is far less than the rate obtaining in Malabar and South Kanara, though the condition of the soil and the nature of the water-supply and the mode of cultivation are the same in all these places. Still, Sir, those Governments have realized that the depression is so severe and the fall in prices so catastrophic that they should go to the rescue of the ryots in their territories. Those benign Governments have given a remission of  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per cent and 25 per cent even when their tax-payers have a comparatively lighter burden than their neighbours in Malabar and South Kanara. It therefore stands to reason that in Malabar and South Kanara where the conditions and the sources of cultivation are similar to those in Travancore and Cochin the ryot's burden is far heavier; they should be given a remission of 25 per cent at least if not more.

"My learned Friend went on to argue that the interest on deposits in banks is low and so also the income derived from the investment in land and that therefore the ryots' difficulties are the same and he should not complain. Both come under the same category and therefore no relief need be given to the ryots. I may tell him that if the income of the investors in banks goes down they are charged income-tax only on the income they get, whether big or small, whereas in the case of the investors in land, whatever be the income derived, the assessment proposed and charged is the same. That is very unsatisfactory. That is the fallacy in the argument of the hon. Member from Ganjam. Far from showing that relief should not be given to the ryots, the illustration cited by my Friend supports the case of the ryots. Where income-tax is collected on the lower returns of the investor in banks the tax on the land should be also proportionate to the income received by the ryot and as the present income is less, the tax should be proportionately reduced.

"Then my hon. Friend said that, if we give a lower scale of pay to the Government servants, the efficiency of the Government would suffer. Sir, when prices went up and Government servants found it difficult to pull on, this House was called upon to vote for increased salaries for them. Did the House then grudge to vote for that grant? No. Now, why should they stick on to their high salaries and not come to the rescue of the ryots when the prices have gone down? When the prices were low and the Government servants were getting lower rates of salary, did efficiency in the administration suffer? By a cut in pay, how can the efficiency of the Government suffer now in view of the fact that prices are low?

"Sir, so far as South Kanara is concerned, I have got a special appeal to make. The conditions there are very miserable. So far as the ryots of South Kanara are concerned, I have given notice of a question which is yet to be answered asking for the number of holdings which have been put up for auction and sold for non-payment of assessment. A list of that kind would convincingly show how hard hit the ryots of South Kanara are. There have been a number of conferences of landholders of South Kanara. The South Kanara District 'Landholders' Association presided over by my hon. Friend Mr. Sami Venkatachalam

30th January 1934] [Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt]

Chetti recently passed a resolution that nothing short of 25 per cent remission would meet the ends of justice and relieve the sufferings of the ryots of South Kanara. It was followed by two or three taluk conferences and there also resolutions have been passed to the same effect. So far as South Kanara is concerned, it is a country where the Government have not spent anything for water-supply. The South Kanara agriculturists depend solely upon the monsoon and upon private enterprise for water-supply so far as cultivation is concerned but still what is the condition there? The taxation on land is far higher than in other places in the presidency though the soil is comparatively not so rich as in many other parts of the presidency. Such being the case, why should South Kanara not be given a higher rate of reduction in the assessment than the mere 10 per cent reduction which is to be given to all the areas? I therefore request, Sir, this House, apart from what Sir Patro has said, to pass this resolution unanimously and come to the rescue of the ryots in this very critical hour. This House has always been ready at the time of emergencies to vote emergency grants to meet the needs of the Government and why should the Government not now come to the rescue of the ryots at this juncture?"

\* Mr. T. C. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—“I do not think many words 1 p.m.  
will be needed from me to support a proposition containing so reasonable a request and I would not have intervened in the debate but for the fact that the hon. Member, Sir Patro, has come forward with a speech which on close analysis appears to be contradictory in itself and also inconsistent with the whole principle underlying the proposal. One wonders whether he is not saying that the hon. the Revenue Member and his Colleagues have done a great mistake in granting a 12½ per cent remission in the assessment of land revenue. One wonders again, if Sir Patro had been consulted, whether he would have advised giving any remission at all. At the same time he has come forward with a proposal which takes one's breath away. He would support a proposal for the remission of revenue due from the poorer pattadars paying Rs. 10 and below. Is it merely by way of a controversy that he raises this proposition or is he convinced that a case for remission exists and that remission should be given only to poorer pattadars? And by a peculiar process of unexpressed definition he has assured himself that pattadars paying Rs. 10 and less are poor people and that pattadars paying Rs. 10 and above are rich people, and that in any scheme of remission all rich people should be taxed for the purpose of remitting the revenue payable by poorer pattadars paying Rs. 10 and less. I submit that Sir Patro's speech has not only not added any useful arguments one way or the other, but has created an amount of confusion and contradiction. As for the merits of the proposal under debate, it goes without saying that we are passing through serious times and very distressing conditions. Even in South India we have not escaped from the recent difficulties in the case of agricultural lands. On account of heavy storm in the Indian Ocean two or three districts in the South have suffered very seriously during the last week—the squally weather has caused considerable damage to

[Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar] [30th January 1934]

both paddy harvested and also about to be harvested. The difficulties of the ryots have increased owing to the fact that prices have not shown any tendency to rise substantially. In these circumstances, would it be a sufficient relief if the ryot is given merely a remission of  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per cent and that too in the shape of suspension? What would be the effect of this suspension? It would amount to an enhancement of revenue if it is sought to be collected next year. What I submit is that there should not be merely a suspension, but that there should be a remission and that too of a higher percentage."

Diwan Bahadur M. GOPALASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"Just like my hon. Friend, Mr. Bhatt, I say I would not have intervened in the debate but for the fact that my hon. Friend, Sir Patro, made certain remarks which are somewhat surprising. That a man of practical experience and a person who occupied a responsible position in the Government for long years should have made such remarks is a thing that one cannot understand. For example, he said that the Government should have a census of all pattadars owning 10 acres. Then he had recourse to a plan whereby only small pattadars paying Rs. 10 and less should be given relief and that other pattadars should not be given any relief and if at all any relief is given to them only some of them should be given relief. I wonder whether he was speaking as a man of practical experience."

Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. PATRO:—"On a point of personal explanation, I said that every pattadar should be given remission according to the extent of land which he possesses, the smaller pattadar of course having the larger claim. It would be nothing short of ignorance to say that a census or a classification is required of all pattadars owning 10 acres of land."

Diwan Bahadur M. GOPALASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"The information given by Sir Patro has not advanced the matter further. I think he is carrying coal to New Castle. I know much better than he does. He is a man belonging to Metropolis. I come from a place where I am in touch with the people who are large pattadars and also those who own 10 acres or even less than that, and I can speak with more authority on the subject than the hon. Gentleman, Sir Patro. He has put forward a very impracticable proposition and I do not think it is possible for any Government to lay down such a hard and fast rule. I am very glad that the Government have been more sympathetic. My Friend, Mr. R. M. Palat, referred to other Governments. I should think the only point he had in view was to emphasize the fact that Governments of Native States and other Provinces are sympathetic towards the ryots. Apart from that I do not think he had any other consideration. I do not think he was indulging in any manner of destructive criticism. What he wanted to point out and I also wish to point out is that every Government throughout the world is trying to be sympathetic to the ryot who contributes really to the resources of the State. When every other Government and administration is sympathetic, it is but natural that the Madras Government



30th January 1934] [Mr. M. Gopalaswami Mudaliyar]

should also be sympathetic towards their ryots, and we have all been very grateful to the Government for having issued the communiqué thus giving relief to the ryots. So far as I am concerned, it does not matter much about the percentage of remission that they have given. I need hardly say that a 25 per cent remission would satisfy me. After all, the percentage is fixed by them according to certain data. All that I am concerned with is that so far as the Ceded districts, Bellary, Coimbatore and Salem districts are concerned, the Government have only granted a suspension of  $6\frac{1}{4}$  per cent. That is a point which the hon. the Revenue Member will, I hope, carefully consider. As one of his hon. Colleagues knows, we, in those districts, are in a very unfortunate position this year. Although we are not confronted with drought this year, we are suffering on account of excess of rains. We have double the normal quantity of rain and in consequence the crops have been spoiled or destroyed. In this connexion I also think that it is very necessary that I should bring to the notice of the hon. the Revenue Member that we are attacked with epidemics in our districts. All these add to the miseries of the ryots. For all these reasons I want to make an earnest appeal to the hon. the Revenue Member that there ought not to be any distinction between wet and dry lands. In this connexion, I want to remove one misapprehension in the minds of hon. Members of this House, viz., that the ryots are ashamed of begging. It is because of this economic distress that they come forward with appeals for relief. I hope this point will also be borne in mind by the Government in giving relief to the ryots."

\* Sriman M. G. PATNAIK Mahasayo:—"Sir, the question raised is quite clear and I need not add anything to that but for the controversial turn it has taken on account of Sir Patro's speech. Sir Patro said that remission of rent should be raised in proportion to the lowness of assessment that is paid, and that smaller pattadars should be given a higher rate of remission than bigger pattadars. Of course almost every other hon. Member said that that was an absurd proposition. I think that is not so absurd as it appears to some of the hon. Members. The analogy of investors who invest money in business or in banks cannot be brought in here. Of course people who invest money in business or in banks are satisfied even if they get a lesser return than what they anticipated and are satisfied with a small profit. But in the case of small pattadars they have to live with the small income that they get from the lands. So if the whole amount or a large portion is not remitted, they will not be able to get on. Sir Patro wanted to emphasize this point. That is all. The only difficulty is whether it would be practicable for the Government to make such a differentiation. It is quite possible that a person might have purchased a small holding and be paying Rs. 10 towards assessment of that land or that a big pattadar might have a large family to maintain. Of course there are many considerations to be taken into account. If you want to take into consideration all those factors it would be impossible for any one

[Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo] [30th January 1934]

to come to any conclusion with regard to the amount of remission to be given in the case of the one or the other. On this ground, Sir Patro's proposition may be unworkable, but one cannot say that it is absurd.

1-15  
p.m.

"Another thing that I wish to say is this: Often you find big pattadars coming forward and placing their grievances before the Government and asking them to give relief to them and also to the poorer pattadars. It is not always possible for the poorer pattadars to come forward with appeals. So the bigger pattadars should be sympathetic to persons who cultivate their lands. But these bigger pattadars want to collect as much as possible from the people who cultivate the lands, though they try to get as much remission as possible from Government. Therefore the bigger landholder should have sympathy towards the people who cultivate the soil. These big mirasidars do not have as much sympathy for the cultivators under them as they expect to get from the Government for themselves. The Government have come forward to give some relief to the ryotwari tracts. Certain amendments agreed to by all the parties were put before the Council during the discussion of the Estates Land Act Amendment Bill, but they were ruled out of order. In spite of the fact that those amendments have been agreed to by all the parties, the Government have not taken any steps to place them on the statute book. The tenants in estates deserve relief more than the tenants in ryotwari tracts. I appeal to the hon. the Revenue Member to lose no time to place those 'agreed' amendments on the statute book.

"I want to say a few words with regard to the Ghoomsur division of my district. Some time ago, the hon. the Revenue Member was pleased to observe that the kist should be collected only after the harvest is over. In my district as well as in several other districts harvest is over only in the month of January. Therefore, the kist should be made payable only in February. But that is not the case at present. Representations were made to the Collector, the Board of Revenue and the Government on this matter. The Government said: 'You people are going away to Orissa and we are not going to give you any relief even though it is in accordance with the principle enunciated by us.' That is very unjust and I hope the hon. the Revenue Member will revise the orders that the Government have passed.

"There is also another difficulty from which the people of the Ghoomsur division suffer. That division adjoins a number of feudatory States of Orissa. Large quantities of paddy are dumped into Ghoomsur from those States and this has reduced the price of paddy in Ghoomsur to an abnormal extent. Even Russellkonda is 50 miles from Berhampur and paddy has to be carried in carts. In these circumstances, the people of Ghoomsur are not able to sell their paddy or they get very low prices for it. The assessment should be reduced by 50 per cent if some relief should be given to them. A cartload of paddy which used to sell for Rs. 40 is now selling at Rs. 10 or Rs. 12. In

30th January 1934] [Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo]

spite of all these the Government have not taken any steps to prevent the dumping of paddy into the Ghumsur division notwithstanding the several representations made to them."

Mr. G. SIMHACHALAM PANTULU:—"Sir, however fallacious the arguments advanced by Sir Patro may have been, I see there is a principle involved in it. Even in municipalities, in the case of profession-tax, we see that the same principle is applied. We always see that anything that we do serves the greatest number of people. On that principle, I think the suggestion made by Sir Patro seems to be sound. But whatever that may be, it has become a commonplace with us here for people to advance some arguments as they are anxious to get a remission and for the Members on the Treasury Benches to advance some other arguments as they want to avoid giving a remission. I am not going to waste the precious time of the House by advancing commonplace arguments, but I see that the difficulty of the whole thing lies here. The officers who go about collecting the revenue are not given full freedom to report to the Government the actual state of affairs. If they felt themselves free to report to the Government the actual state of affairs, they would certainly do so. I find that many officers are afraid to report the actual state of affairs to the Government for fear they might lose their jobs. If the Government are keen about granting remission, they can find a way out of the difficulty. I appeal to the hon. the Revenue Member and the hon. the Finance Member to remove this popular impression, namely, that even though the representatives of the people know the facts about the condition of the people and vigorously represent them to the Government, it is impossible for them to convince the Government of the great need there is for a remission and get the required remission. If we are able to persuade the Government to give a remission at least this year as desired by many hon. Members, we will be justifying our existence here as representatives of the people. Otherwise it is a disgrace for any representative to come here, to make his representations to the Government and every time be told by the Government that they would not believe them and that they would rely only on the reports of their own local officers, who, as I have already pointed out, are afraid to report to the Government the actual state of affairs. If that is the state of affairs, there is no use of anyone continuing as a Member of this House. What is the use of discussing this question time and again and invariably getting the reply, 'No'? I suggest that if the Government felt any doubt about the actual state of affairs, they might appoint a committee to go into the question and send a detailed report. Mr. Gopalaswami Mudaliyar made some suggestions with regard to certain districts and some other hon. Members made some suggestions with regard to the deltaic districts. But Guntur is in an intermediate position being half dry and half wet. The conditions there are peculiar. It is only if we can do something to the ryots—I mean by ryots, the actual cultivators, the agriculturists—that we can justify our existence as representatives of the people. I



[Mr. G. Simhachalam Pantulu] [30th January 1934]

appeal to the Treasury Benches once again to see that we are not looked upon as fools in the estimation of the public by saying 'no' to all our representations."

\* Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR:—"Mr. President, I am extremely thankful to Sir Patro for having stimulated the discussion in the House. The House was getting rather dull and perhaps Sir Patro thought to himself: 'If I threw a pill too big to be swallowed, they might struggle with it to throw it out and in that process get themselves stimulated.'

"Sir, this is not a question of Malabar or South Kanara, but this is a question of the Presidency as a whole. It is well known to all, I suppose even the Treasury Benches understand it, that the ryots are overtaxed. Some districts have been vociferous in their demands for reduction, but I should like to ask: 'What about the district of Chingleput?' That district is not so productive as Tanjore. Even in Tanjore which is considered to be most prosperous, the net income on an acre of land is only Rs. 7 in the case of first-class lands. The net income of the first-rate land is only Rs. 40 for a veli. How is it possible for a man to cultivate a veli if he has only Rs. 50 for maintenance of his family? If that is the state of affairs in Tanjore, how much worse should it be with districts like Chingleput where there has been no rain at all this year. I am glad the Collector there is taking some interest in the question and he may even recommend a remission of 50 per cent. But even that 50 per cent will not meet the needs of the situation.

"There is a universal complaint about the low prices of agricultural produce. These are selling at the same rate as they were selling in pre-war days. I do not think we should attempt to raise the prices of these foodstuffs, for the poor man will suffer. What we should do is to let the foodstuffs sell at the same price as they do now and cut the cost of administration. There has been a demand for Indianization of our services, and the justification for the demand is found in the fact that an Indianized service will be cheaper than the present service. If that is so, there is no meaning in Indianizing the service and paying the same high salaries to Indian Officers as to European Officers. A Provincial Service Collector may get two-thirds of the pay of an Indian Service Collector. The Governor, the Members of the Executive Council and the Judges of the High Court may get the same salaries as they get now; I do not object to that. But the officers in the other higher posts should get much lower pay. It is the elevation of economic condition of the people that is really at the bottom of the demand for Indianization. What is the use of having a top-heavy administration with many high-salaried officers, if that can be done only by squeezing the ryot and starving the development and nation-building departments? I appeal to the hon. the Revenue Member and the hon. the Finance Member to settle this question of salaries once for all. We cannot go on repeating the same tale every year of an increasing expenditure and thus not reducing the tax. If

30th January 1934] [Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar]

an European element is wanted in our services, let us pay the European officers overseas allowances so that they may get the same pay as they are getting now. But let the Indians who are serving the Government remember that they are serving their country. In Germany and other places, the Government servants get much lower salaries. The Captain of a German Ship gets Rs. 250, whereas the Captain of an English ship gets Rs. 600 or Rs. 700."

MR. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"What about Ministers?"

\* RAO BAHADUR C. NATESA MUDALIYAR:—"So long as the Members of the Executive Council get a certain pay, the Ministers also should get the same pay. Of course, we may change the rate in the Reformed Constitution, but for the present both should get the same pay.

"With regard to the benefit that the mirasidars will get, of course, if a small cultivator gets two annas, a big mirasidar will get Rs. 100. We should not grudge what the mirasidar gets. The two annas will be quite as useful to the small cultivator as the Rs. 100 to the big mirasidar. Let everybody be benefited. But there is no use of squeezing the ryot and starving the nation-building departments and inviting an iniquitous impost from the Central Government once more. I warn the Government seriously against this. So many years have passed and still there has been no improvement in the nation-building departments. I cannot say no but not enough. The hon. Member, Mr. Gopalaswami Mudaliyar, said that the Government is sympathetic, but I request them to be sufficiently sympathetic. If they remit 25 per cent, then they would be sympathetic. They have given this 12½ per cent remission, I believe, because of so much agitation.

"Most probably there will be a Commission sitting to apportion the contributions from various Provinces to the Central Government. That Commission may look at our accumulated balances and saddle us with a heavy contribution. Would they know that these balances have been possible only by squeezing the ryots and starving the nation-building departments? Would they know the difficulties that the ryots suffer by not being able to make both ends meet, especially the ryots in the Chingleput district? Resettlement once in thirty years does not mean that the Government should go on increasing the taxes irrespective of the conditions existing. If the conditions warrant, the taxes should be reduced. I request the Government to grant a remission of 25 per cent and to treat the Chingleput district with greater favour than other districts."

#### After Lunch (2-30 p.m.)

\* MR. P. PEDDI RAJU:—"Mr. President, Sir, I have to intervene in this debate. Last year a similar resolution was unanimously passed and there was not much contest. But unfortunately just now our knight Sir Patro uttered a note of warning to the Government practically against conceding the demands of the ryotwari landholders. I

[Mr. P. Peddi Raju]

[30th January 1934]

am sorry that Sir Patro had removed himself from Ganjam and has become a metropolitan and has failed to represent the grievances of the voters whom he actually intended to represent. Moreover, my Friend hails from a district which is mostly zamindari and I feel that he can never realize the grievances of the ryotwari tracts. All the same, though the hon. the Revenue Member is absent, I can appeal to Mr. Thorne, the Revenue Secretary. The appalling condition of the upland ryots has been well described by my hon. Friend, Mr. Gopalaswami Mudaliyar. People generally think that the delta ryots are in a better position. I come from a district which is mainly deltaic. I think that Tanjore and Trichinopoly districts are like Godavari and Kistna districts. No doubt there was a time when people in these districts were in a better position. But the plight of the delta ryots now is much worse than it ever was. The price that is now existing is Rs. 2-6-0 per bag. Ten bags an acre is said to be normal yield in the delta. Even in the Government accounts—in the adangal—when ten bags is the yield, they put it as 16 annas crop. Last year in answer to my Friend, Mr. Krishnayya, the hon. the Revenue Member said that there may be lands in the delta which may yield 20 bags. This is an extraordinary circumstance which I can never realize. There is hardly a single acre in the delta which yields 20 bags. The average yield of land is only 10 bags an acre. At the rate of Rs. 2-6-0 a bag, the gross income per acre is less than Rs. 25. The average Government assessment in the delta is Rs. 10 to Rs. 12. It is not less than Rs. 10. The gross yield per acre is 10 bags an acre. What are the charges that have to be incurred by the ryotwari landholder for cultivation expenses, for harvest and for seasonal variations and other things? What is the benefit that he derives? Of course the Government may say and the hon. the Revenue Member has said that large amounts of money are being spent for the improvement of drainage and irrigation channels and that Government activities will suffer in the way of undertaking developments throughout. I have to say to the Government that the ordinary agriculturist does not care whether the Government undertake development in other directions so long as he suffers from the distress caused by the economic depression and the prevailing low prices. My hon. Friends have said that the cost of administration by way of salaries is too heavy and I will have to tell the Government that the ordinary peon in any department of the Government is much better than a landholder who has got 100 acres at the present time. It is high time that the Government should open their eyes and see that the ryotwari landholder is not oppressed. There is no reason to suck the blood of the ryot and then pay fat to the officials and some Round Tablers to go to England. It is advisable that the Government should retrench their establishments and cut short their expenditure and see that the general population in the Presidency do not suffer on account of the economic depression. Whether it is reasonable or unreasonable, whether the land revenue policy of the Government is placed on the statute book or not, it is the duty of any Government whether it is the British Government or a



30th January 1934] [Mr. P. Peddi Raju]

Swaraj Government to see that the general mass of the people do not suffer on account of the present economic depression. Sitting here, it is very easy to say that it is easy to pay the land revenue. The question is 'How are you to pay the heavy assessment, how are you to get from the landholder a portion of the produce he gets from the land?' I am sorry to see that the hon. the Revenue Member and the hon. the Finance Member have not realized the great distress existing throughout the Presidency. It is not one district that suffers. Every representative of every district complains about his own district, because he knows the state of things there. But it is for the Government to realize the difficulty felt throughout the Presidency. I have heard the officials saying that the registration of documents and the price of land are still found to be high. The reason is nobody is able to pay his dues and all lands are going into the hands of the money-lenders. If this state of things continues it is not only the poor ryot but also the rich ryot is going to insolvency. If the Government do not come to the rescue, I am sure and I can prophesy that all the lands will go to the money-lenders. Then there will be a revolution, if not some bloodshed and other things. The hon. the Revenue Member has toured throughout the Presidency. I do not know whether he has been intimated of this fact. There are places in the district where the money-lenders' houses are threatened to be dacoited some day or other. The villagers have all joined and they are trying to give any amount of trouble to the money-lender because the money-lender does not take the land and there is no way of paying the dues. It is not simply a question of paying assessment to the Government. The Government will have to consider the question from an economic point of view and to see how they can give relief. Twenty-five per cent remission is a very reasonable demand which the Legislative Council has made. I do not think anybody will be satisfied with 25 per cent. From the administrative point of view some amount of revenue is necessary and the Government must be satisfied with 75 per cent of the assessment. So I appeal to the hon. the Revenue Member and the Finance Member to see that at least this demand of the Legislative Council is met. I also request the Government that 25 per cent of the kist may be remitted this year and that they can wait and see what should be done next year. Last year the hon. the Revenue Member said that there was a tendency for rise in prices; but that prophecy has not been fulfilled. This year there has been a further fall of 25 per cent in the prices. The hon. the Revenue Member admitted last year that prices were too low and said that there is some chance of improvement. What is the condition to-day? It is much worse. So, the Government should not be blind to the distress existing in the country; they should open their eyes and give succour to the ryots."

\* MR. G. LAKSHMANA REDDI:—"Sir, I rise to support the motion. Of course my hon. Friend, Sir Patro, has got quite a different view-point of the Famine Code. According to the Government at any rate, when there are no crops, the Government can interfere and give remissions. But according to Sir Patro, where there is no crop, it is only

[Mr. G. Lakshmana Reddi] [30th January 1934]

the poor man paying a kist of Rs. 10 and less that should be given remission and not the other class of ryots. I do not think that his view will be accepted even by the Government.

"Coming to the question on hand, the Government suspended 12½ per cent kist last year in the case of some districts. But this year the Government have issued a communiqué stating that only 6½ per cent of the kist will be remitted in the case of dry lands and 12½ per cent remission in the case of wet lands all over the Presidency. I submit that the situation this year is worse than last year all over the Presidency. So far as the Ceded districts are concerned, I have personal knowledge. Dry lands predominate there. The ryots there are in a very distressing plight. The yield this year also was poor. Add to this the abnormal fall in prices. There is very poor demand for agricultural produce. In most cases the yield is not enough to cover the agricultural expenses incurred by the ryot. I think that, for this year, at least 25 per cent remission is necessary. There is a clear case for remission of 25 per cent. I therefore earnestly request the hon. the Revenue and the Finance Members to agree to the modest request of the Mover."

2-45  
p.m.

\* Khan Bahadur MAHMUD SCHAMNAD SAHIB Bahadur:—"Sir, I do not understand, in fact I am very much surprised to see, how the Government failed to realize the distress prevailing among the people. If the Government had really known the difficulties, they would not have been so heartless. But I now see it is no wonder that the Government have not realized them when my hon. Friend, Sir Parasuram Patro, who says that he is an advocate of the cause of the people and who had been to England for the Round Table Conference to represent India, himself does not seem to have realized those difficulties. There is a sort of eyewash in his statement and I think nobody will be deceived by that. My friend says that the poor ryots who pay less than Rs. 10 should be given full remission and that the rich people should be made to pay, even so much as to cover the remission granted to the poor people. He knows very well that the Government will not accept such a proposal. There is no principle involved in that. It is only a camouflage. It is well known to the hon. Members here, and they have taken every opportunity to inform the Government of it, how acute the distress is that is prevailing in the country. I can speak about my own district with authority. There, so many very valuable lands have been sold for nominal prices, lands worth Rs. 50,000 have been sold for Rs. 2,000. There are several instances of this kind. Some time back, I asked a question to find out how many such lands were sold for nominal prices; the Government reply was that they had called for information and that the information had not been received.

"My friend, Dr. Natesa Mudaliyar said, it is not only a question of South Kanara or Malabar. It is true, but still there is something peculiar or special in the case of Malabar and South Kanara. Because, in all the other districts the tenants' improvements are not taxed, while in Malabar and South Kanara where you have no Government irrigation

30th January 1934] [Mr. Mahmud Schamnad]

works and Government are not spending a pie for helping the ryots who cultivate their lands, tenants' improvements are taxed. Although there is copious rainfall for three or four months in the year, all the water is washed down to the ocean and no measures are taken by Government to conserve the water by either anicuts or bunds, etc. On former occasions attempts were made to induce Government to conserve some water by anicuts, etc., in order to help the ryots in cultivating second and third crops. As it is, the people have to spend a large amount of money for building anicuts, digging big wells and tanks, etc. All that is never taken into account in taxing lands in Malabar and South Kanara and they are charged just in the same way as lands on the East Coast where they have got irrigation facilities, etc. You know, Sir, even recently several crores of rupees were spent on the Cauvery-Mettur project. When you compare the assessment in South Kanara and Malabar with that in the other districts, it will be found that the rate of assessment in South Kanara and Malabar is higher than that in the other districts. I wanted to know some time back by a question, whether the tenants' improvements in South Kanara and Malabar were taxed. The answer was rather evasive. As it was an unstarred question, I could not elicit further information on the matter. The answer was 'there are different kinds of tenants' improvements, and all those kinds are not taxed.' Some such answer was given. All over the Presidency ryots' meetings have been held and resolutions have been passed and sent to the Government on the difficulty of paying the taxes, but Government seem not to have realized the difficulties of the ryots. My friend Mr. Palat said that remissions have been given on a much larger scale in the Indian States such as Hyderabad, Mysore, etc. That statement was challenged by my friend Sir Parasuram Patro who said that he knew the conditions of those States, that they did not spend much money as this Government on nation-building activities. May I know, if he has seen their budgets, what is the total income there, how much of it is provided for industries and other nation-building departments, and how much remission has been given there? He has not said anything about those things, but has simply said that they have provided very little for nation-building departments and that we here are spending so much more. It is not so, Sir. I find from the budget of those States and from other information available through the papers, that they have spent much more during the past three years on the agricultural and other departments than we have done in this province. Moreover we have large balances also; I do not know why we are accumulating these balances unless it be for helping the ryots in lean years, when they are in distress and difficulties. Simply because reforms are going to come and we are to have a reformed Government, we cannot go on accumulating balances for the future Government if we are ourselves going to be no more, to enjoy that future Government.

"It was asked on the last occasion when this same question was being discussed, by the hon. the Finance Member, whether we ought not to make provision for Part II Schemes for agriculture, industries



[Mr. Mahmud Schamnad] [30th January 1934]

and other departments. I say, we certainly should suspend those activities for some time until we are able to stand upon our legs. Every year you are making some provision from out of the revenue for 'Avoidance of debts,' for 'capital expenditure,' etc. They ought not to be provided for from revenue at all. They should be met from loans. When we cannot even manage to pay our assessment and make both ends meet, how can we provide for 'avoidance of debts' and for capital expenditure from revenue? If the Government are only sympathetic, they will find that the claim for 33 per cent remission is not at all excessive. Let them not think that by giving this remission of 25 per cent which is now asked for in this resolution, they cannot find sufficient money for the nation-building departments; even if it be so, let them suspend activities in those departments. Let them also take something out of the balances which are being kept separately. With these words, Sir, I support this resolution."

MR. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"Mr. President, I consider that this subject is far too serious to be made a joke of by any hon. Member. This Council expects from the doyen of this Council much more seriousness at least in considering a matter which affects the very life and the main stay of both the Government and the people of the country. My hon. Friend, Sir Patro, began his speech by deploring the fact that both sides of the House are depleted in strength. Perhaps the reason was the possibility of Sir Patro's speech (laughter). I am glad Members were absent, lest they should also have suffered the same humility and the injury which those of us who were present here had the misfortune to undergo.

"Sir Patro has described his own speech very aptly. He said he was not saying anything either this way or that. That is a very bad description which could not possibly be made by anybody about his own speech. At one time he would say that the Government has to protect the ryot, that every possible facility should be given to the ryot and that this was not the time when the Government should be banking on their rules or regulations. At another time, he would say just the opposite. If any one reads his speech in connexion with the Budget Demand on Land Revenue, one would think that Sir Patro was quite a different incarnation from what he is to-day. To-day he is thoroughly changed. I do not know what that change is due to. Future events, people say, cast their shadows before. (An hon. Member: No motive please.) I am glad to be assured that there is absolutely no motive behind what he has said. But if that assurance had come from the hon. Member from Ganjam instead of from the hon. Member for Cuddapah, it would have been more assuring.

"Sir, I happened to travel a large tract of this Presidency during the last two or three months; and wherever I went, I found that the condition of the agriculturist whether he was a large pattadar or a small pattadar, was simply miserable, and baffled description. I am glad in this connexion to state that the Government are quite alive to the situation, that they recognize that the prices have fallen so low that it is

30th January 1934] [Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti]

impossible for the cultivator or the pattadar to be able to pay his tax properly, and that if the Government had not been able to give him any adequate relief, it was because they had to meet other expenditure. There is no doubt some plausibility in that argument, but the question is: what is the other expenditure that is so paramount and that is so immediately necessary, even in preference to the relief that should be accorded to the pattadar during these times? I for one have no hesitation in saying that it is possible for the Government to retrench their expenditure considerably in order to give the relief that is asked for on the floor of this House and in several of the conferences of landholders held throughout the country. Sir, while admitting that the agriculturist is in a very bad condition, that he requires the support and protection of the Government, to restore the cut from out of the salaries of Provincial Service men seems to be an unpardonable mistake. Sir, that mistake ought to be remedied. I know very well that in recommending that course I am naturally injuring the interests of several Indians who are now in service; but that cannot be helped. And I do not think that any Indian in Madras who is receiving his salary without the cut would like to be in a better position when his neighbour, the agriculturist, is in dire circumstances. I am sure that if the proposition is put to them to-day, they would themselves surrender the cut. I therefore put before the Government this proposal: that if money is quite necessary, it can be found from the restored cut of the Government servants.

"Again, Sir, much is said about the expenditure that is necessary on the nation-building departments which are paraphrased in the language of my friend, Sir Patro, as the Development Department. I should like to have more details about these nation-building departments or the Development Department, whose needs appear to him more urgent than the relief that is absolutely necessary for the agriculturist.

"Sir, all that is possible and that can be spared for these nation-building departments is, I think, by one device or another taken away by the hon. the Finance Member. The Education Department is practically reduced to its former position, probably earlier than 1920 or 1922. By one method or another the hon. the Finance Member was so clever as to induce the Minister to fall in with his proposals, so much so that a good deal of the Education Budget is cut away. Sir, we have two Chancellors of Exchequer for the Madras Province. Sir Thomas Moir had an impregnable exterior, but Sir Hopetoun Stokes has a velvet glove on his iron hand. That is all the difference between these two Chancellors of Exchequer. I do not believe that so much money is necessary even for the purpose of maintaining the essential needs of the nation-building departments. It is all put up for the sake of argument that the nation-building departments will be starved if further relief is given. I beg to submit that, if it comes to that, I would rather prefer the nation-building departments to be starved than to allow the ryots going without any relief whatsoever from the Government.

"Sir, my hon. Friend, Sir Patro, suggested, as if to please the Government, that instead of giving wholesale remission at a certain

[Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti] [30th January 1934]

percentage to all pattadars, a graded system might be adopted and particularly suggested the remission of the whole revenue that would be derived from the pattadars who pay an assessment of Rs. 10 and less. While saying this he made it appear to the Council that he himself being a ryot, that he himself having very much to do with the agriculturists, he had a better knowledge of the state of affairs than most of us can possess and I am afraid, Sir, he was speaking entirely without book. I do not know for one reason or another, why this statement showing the extent of holdings according to the assessment, has been omitted in the later reports of the settlement of land revenue. For instance, in 1931-32 we have not got the statement, but in 1930-31 there is. On calculation on the basis of whole remission in the case of all pattadars who pay Rs. 10 and less, the amount comes to 138 lakhs, whereas the Government proposals result only in a remission of 60 lakhs of rupees."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" May I remind the hon. Member of the time-limit."

MR. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—" Was that proposition suggested only to defeat the other proposition that nobody should get remission, or was it suggested in favour of the Government, so that they may carry on the administration? Evidently, he has miscalculated the whole thing and thought that by quoting an extreme proposition he would be putting himself right with the poor people and also putting himself right with the Government. Sir, such a dubious position cannot possibly be sustained in a House which has access to facts and figures at a moment's notice. (Sir Patro: 'Pseudo-patriotism'). Sir, I do not know why this question of pseudo-patriotism should come in here. I have not loved England in preference to India and therefore the question of pseudo-patriotism does not arise. He must know the meaning of the words 'patriot and patriotism' before he can hurl that appellation on me. I wonder, Sir, when my hon. Friend is going to learn consistency, when he is going to learn restraint and when he is going to learn dignity in a House of this sort. (Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed: Consistency is not a virtue.)

" Sir, with reference to the remission now suggested by the Government, there is one point to which I would like the Government to pay greater consideration. That is with regard to the difference they make between districts having recent resettlement and those districts which had been settled long ago. The result is that, with regard to resettled areas, the benefit they get is merely a remission of the increased assessment. With regard to the other districts, they get  $9\frac{1}{4}$  per cent more. It is desirable that, as the misery, the difficulty and the economic depression is universal, all the districts should be treated alike.

" There is also one more thing which I would like to submit to the Government. They have placed these proposals before the Finance Committee and the Finance Committee, thinking that a constructive proposal might help the Government, recommended a remission of  $18\frac{3}{4}$



30th January 1934] [Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti]

per cent for wet lands and  $9\frac{3}{4}$  for dry lands. Whereas, the Government thought that a uniform  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per cent remission might be granted. The Government take advantage of the recommendation of the Finance Committee so far as the dry lands are concerned and would not accept the recommendation made so far as the wet lands are concerned. That is really unfair. In fact, the dry lands have never been quite so lucrative as the wet lands and, if remission should be granted, since people have suffered equally from the products of the dry or wet lands, they should not make a small difference between these two things. From this sort of difference it appears to me that the Government are parsimonious in the matter of affording relief in times like this, when I expect the Government to be more generous. The ryots stood by the Government all along. They have been responsible for filling up the coffers of the Government. They have been able not only to feed themselves but also the rest of the population and it is therefore desirable that Government should come to the rescue of the agriculturist in a generous measure, he being the mainstay of the Province. It is not unknown to the Government that other industries—other than agriculture—like steel, piecegoods and such other industries, are able to get protection by means not only of subvention but also through protective duties. Having regard to that, though that matter may not be within the province of the Provincial Government, it is desirable that the Provincial Government should point out the invidious distinction they are making between a commercial industry and an agricultural industry, and try to get some relief, if not by remission, at least by way of subvention to the agriculturists. It is this point of view that I want to urge upon the Government. It should not be supposed that Members of the Legislative Council are irresponsible in asking for such a high percentage of remission. It is not so. We are quite alive to the very depressing condition all round and it is impossible to be more moderate than to ask for a reduction of 25 per cent. If only we should adjust our demands to the needs of the country, to the existing state of affairs, the percentage of reduction that we ask for must certainly be greater. I dare say, so far as the facts and figures are concerned, Government are not willing to dispute them and I do not think they will have the hardihood to dispute them. Their difficulty, as I have said, may be with regard to the adjustment of the budget. Sir, adjustment of the budget may also be accomplished by raising a loan and it is not after all a very humiliating thing for a Government to raise a loan and adjust the budget for some years. We have done so in previous years when the exigencies of the situation required. (The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell: 'When?') Yes, during the war. After all, in the history of Governments, I do not think this is an undesirable course in order to tide over the difficulty. I place this matter before the hon. the Revenue Member, the hon. the Finance Member and other Members of Government, for a sympathetic, generous and broad-minded consideration and not to higggle over facts. It may be, Sir, that some facts may be wrong and some exaggerated, but there is no good of raising any objection on account of that. What we want is this. We want to impress upon you the need for giving a generous

[Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti] [30th January 1934]

measure of relief, if you are convinced of the necessity of protecting the agriculturist from utter starvation and ruin and allow him to live, so that he may be able to feed the Government for all time to come."

Mr. C. BASU DEV:—"Mr. President, if I rise to intervene in the debate on this difficult question of remission, it is to express my doubt whether this Council is after all proceeding in the right direction in this matter. This Council has no jurisdiction to tackle questions of exchange and other international issues and perhaps Members of this Council have thought fit to have recourse to the easy though momentary relief by granting remission. I must at the outset make my position clear and assure the agriculturist that I am in entire sympathy with his troubles and his difficulties. The hon. Member who preceded me has told the House how we had come across the indescribable misery of the agriculturist. I too have in my humble way come across the misery of the agriculturist, but in the course of the conversation I had with the agriculturists, I came to understand that what they really want is not the pittance of a remission of  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per cent or 25 per cent, but a more substantial and permanent relief and that can only be done by a thorough examination and revision of the system of land revenue in this Province. There is no good in resorting to this slipshod method of asking for remissions year after year and upsetting the administration of the Province. I would therefore respectfully suggest to this House that the better method would be to have a very thorough revision of the land revenue system. A 25 per cent remission which the hon. Members of this House suggest will not help the ryot substantially, nor relieve his distress. If a remission of Rs. 3 for a period of twelve months is given, I am sure it is not going to help him materially. I am not for one moment suggesting that no relief should be given to the agriculturists of this Province. (Mr. Basheer Ahmed: 'Then you want more relief to be given?') Every relief should be afforded to the agriculturist and the method you are suggesting is not the proper method as it would not give him adequate or permanent relief. (Mr. Basheer Ahmed: 'What is your method?') If the hon. Member will have patience to hear me out (Mr. Basheer Ahmed: 'It is impossible')—I am very sorry that even eight or nine years of experience in this Council has not taught him patience. (Mr. Basheer Ahmed: 'It is impossible.') I was suggesting that, instead of distributing a remission of  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per cent or 25 or even 50 per cent, if a substantial amount can be wholly set apart for examining the question of affording proper relief in cases of agricultural distress and making a permanent arrangement for meeting contingencies of this sort, the money would have been much better spent. If Government would only set apart the amount of the proposed remission for the purpose of a thorough overhauling of the system and enquiry into the methods by which such distress of the agriculturists could be met, I am sure that would be better and a permanent way of dealing with this question. (Mr. Basheer Ahmed: 'You will vote for this.') I do not know if the Agricultural department or any other department

30th January 1934] [Mr. C. Basudev]

concerned with this question has examined how far the supply is in excess of the demand.

"I do not know if the concerned departments have examined the question of finding markets outside this Province for our produce. I do not know, Sir, if any research has been made as to how far other products can be produced in this country other than paddy and how far lands can be set apart for more profitable produce. I am sorry, Sir, I am only a layman in revenue matters. I could only offer what my humble intelligence tells me. I think that, instead of asking for remissions year after year, this House should address itself to solving the problem in a more satisfactory and more permanent way. I am not suggesting that no remissions should be given. I am one of those who suggested in the Finance Committee that a remission of 18 $\frac{3}{4}$  per cent should be given. That would meet to some extent the discontent in some of the recently resettled districts. It is not going to be a substantial relief but it would be equal to the amount of enhanced assessment. With that view I suggested that the remission may be increased to 18 $\frac{3}{4}$  per cent. I do agree with Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti when he criticised the nation-building departments. I do not know what those departments are doing to really build up the nation. I join with him in questioning the utility of the work they are doing. The Agricultural department is trying to grow two blades where one grew. That will not solve the question. We must find out where to grow and what to grow. There is no good in simply growing paddy in all areas. With these words, I suggest that, instead of asking for 25 per cent, this House should think of supporting the recommendations of the Finance Committee."

\* Sriman M. G. PATNAIK Mahasaya:—"My amendment will be to add the following words: '*Provided that in the assessment in the Goomsur division of the Ganjam district a reduction of 50 per cent be made.*' I have already spoken with regard to this amendment. It was not ready then. My reason is that Goomsur is situated at a great distance from the railway station, and paddy is carried in carts at great cost. Therefore, they have to sell paddy in the division at a low price. Secondly, the neighbouring States of Orissa are dumping large quantities of paddy in Goomsur and the price is thus kept down. These are the reasons I gave and I now formally move the amendment."

\* Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. PATRO:—"I have great pleasure in seconding the amendment. It is difficult to commend this motion to those experts in this Council who do not know to distinguish between a rice plant and a chilly plant. If there are members who have come to that state of knowledge and yet can speak with authority on such important matters, then woe for the times and such party. But, we have not descended to that state of self-delusion. Self-discipline is a virtue which ought to be cultivated not only by every individual, but more so by those who are fortunate enough to be responsible Members of this House. When we forget that self-discipline, of course, we lose our position as responsible Members. I need hardly go into that matter at length. We



[Sir A. P. Patro]

[30th January 1934]

have got a very special case in Ganjam. In Goomsur, we have got a very long distance and on account of that, there is extra cost and added to this there are floods or other causes of ruin. It is specially because of this that this amendment is moved and I am sure that it will meet with the approval of the Government. Unlike other districts which are trotted out by hon. Members in the name of patriotism and whose patriotism is so notorious that I need hardly stoop to analyse . . . ."

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT:—" May I know, Sir, whether a Member of this House can make an insinuation regarding the patriotism or the bona fides of other Members of this House? "

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" The hon. Member must have risen up earlier still."

\* Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. PATRO:—" Thank you, Sir, for giving the apt reply to that very restless Member. However, there it is. With regard to Goomsur, there is a special case for a special treatment. It may not be known to certain people who pose themselves as leaders of people. Though Goomsur is in a corner of the Presidency, surely it is a deserving case and I would appeal to Government to treat this as a special case."

\* Mr. A. B. SHETTY:—" Mr. President, Sir, Sir Patro has drawn upon himself a shower of criticism from different sides of the House on account of some of the injudicious observations he has made. He must be consoling himself with the thought that hard words break no bones. Sir Patro is not right in thinking that, because some of the Benches in this House were thin when he spoke, the Members of this House are indifferent about this resolution. If there is one matter, Sir, on which all sections of this House are united, it is this question of giving adequate relief to the ryot, at this time of exceptional distress. The cry for relief comes not from one district or one set of people, but from all districts of the Province and from all sections of people from Ganjam down to South Kanara. It is very regrettable that Government have not seen their way to accept in full even the very moderate proposals made by the Finance Committee. The extent of relief decided upon by Government is not at all adequate to meet the needs of the situation at this time of exceptional distress. The position this year is much worse than what it was last year and Government themselves seem to have recognized this matter by coming forward, in however inadequate a manner, to give some relief to the ryots in all districts this year. Even last year, Sir, it was with great difficulty that the ryots paid their assessment. Many had to sell their jewels. Many had to borrow money at high rates of interest and in many cases Government had to take coercive measures and attach and sell lands for arrears of land revenue. Sir, now the prices have gone down by 40 to 50 per cent. The ryots find it very difficult to sell their produce. They cannot get credit. The position is very serious indeed. The Government plead that if they give large remissions, they cannot make sufficient provision for the nation-building departments, for Part II schemes. Government can afford to give

30th January 1934]

[Mr. A. B. Shetty]

more relief to the ryots. One way in which Government can find the money for it is by reimposing a cut on the salaries of their servants. The Madras Government were too hasty in restoring the cut imposed year before last. If there is one class of people who are to-day not only not affected by the present economic depression, but are even better off than what they were in previous years, it is the Government officials. Every rupee of the salary they are getting to-day is worth two times as much as what it was half a dozen years ago. So, Government can, without difficulty, reimpose a cut on the salaries of their servants. I do not think Government officials, feeling as they do for their fellow countrymen, will grudge bearing a share of the burden. Secondly, Sir, we found when the last Budget was presented that the Government had a closing balance of 271 lakhs. This accumulated balance can very well be utilized for giving relief to the ryots. Government must give up the policy of meeting capital expenditure out of current revenues and out of balances built up from current revenues. Government must explore all possible ways of giving help to the ryots at a time of distress like this because, as it has been repeatedly said, the agriculturists form not only the bulk of the people of this Province, but they pay the largest part of the Government revenue. Remission in revenue is not the only thing that Government can do to help the ryots. They must take steps to raise the prices of agricultural produce, to provide cheap credit and long-term loans, to help the cultivation of more profitable crops, to find markets for exporting paddy and to prohibit import of rice. Government will be judged by the extent to which they come to the help of the ryot at a time of exceptional crisis like this. The promotion of the welfare of the ryots will be the acid test by which Government will be judged."

\* MR. K. KESAVARAMAMURTI NAYUDU :—" Mr. President, Sir, prices have now gone down by more than 55 per cent. Even a remission of 25 per cent will not go a great way in relieving the distress of the ryots. In Godavari, nobody is willing to pay Rs. 2 per bag. Formerly it was selling at Rs. 6. On account of this fall in prices it has been difficult for the poor ryots to meet even the cultivation expenses after paying the Government kist. The present prices are much lower than those obtaining at the time of the previous settlement. The proposed remission of 12½ per cent will not be of any help to them. Even for the cultivation expenses they have mortgaged their lands and parted with the little gold they had. Now is the time for the Government to show real sympathy and come to their rescue by giving at least 25 per cent remission.

3-30  
p.m.

" I wish in this connexion to say a few words about the Polavaram Island. There the protective bund was left incomplete for six or seven miles. Recently there were two very heavy floods and water rose 2 feet above the protective bund and remained there for about 20 days making the crops completely rot. The present rate of assessment on such lands is about Rs. 10-8-0 per acre. The Polavaram project also forms part of the Godavari delta system. The lands in the Godavari delta bring the Government a profit of about 14 per cent over the

[Mr. K. Kesavaramamurti Nayudu]

[30th January 1934]

investment. I request the Government to combine these two projects and calculate the expenditure which the Government have incurred. By adding the investment on the Polavaram project to the investment on the Godavari delta system, the Government will find it possible to reduce the present rate of Rs. 10-8-0 assessment to the level of assessment which obtains in other ryotwari parts of the delta. That means they can reduce it to the level of Rs. 6-8-0. I request the hon. the Revenue Member to give a favourable consideration to the grievances of the ryots in the Polavaram Island and give them redress. With these few words I support the motion for reduction."

\* Khan Bahadur P. KHALIF-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"Mr. President, Sir, coming as I do from Trichinopoly, I shall be failing in my duty if I do not join in this debate and give expression to the prevalent feelings in the districts of Trichinopoly and Madura. Some hon. Members speaking before me said that during their tours in their districts or in other districts they came across ryots who told them that this would be no relief and that they do not want this relief. I am really at a loss to understand such a sort of ryot. At any rate, I may assure this Government that none such exist either in Tanjore, Trichinopoly or Madura, though they may be in existence in the districts which the other Members represent. The feeling is so acute for obvious reasons. A mirasidar friend of mine owning a village in Tanjore tells me that his tenants give him about 400 kalam of paddy which are sold at about 14 annas a kalam and by way of Government kist alone he has to pay about Rs. 360. So that, taking into account all his receipts and disbursements, he stands to lose some money from out of his pocket for the honour of possessing that village. This instance, I may say, is not a rare one. This difficulty is obtaining throughout these districts."

"Sir, is the depression a temporary one? The hon. the Revenue Member told us last year that it may prove to be temporary and the relief granted might be sufficient. Now we see that it is continuing. Last year the position of the ryot was somewhat better for the reason that the prices were a little higher and also for the reason that the ryot had some capital hoarded up in his notorious treasure troughs. The present high value of the gold has dragged out his entire hoarding and the same has been sold out to meet his present demand. This year the position of the ryot in the entire province is certainly more acute than what it was last year. This year they have nothing to fall back upon, his hoarded gold having been previously sold to relieve the pressure brought to bear upon him by the money-lenders and others. His position is now certainly unbearable. Moreover the difficulty of the ryots to-day consists not only in paying off the debts he has incurred, but also in meeting his day-to-day needs."

"Sir, I heard it said by one hon. Member that for a ryot paying about Rs. 100 as tax, Rs. 25 may not be a great relief. But, I may submit, Sir, I am a mirasidar myself and am paying a few hundred rupees by way of tax. This 25 per cent remission will certainly be



30th January 1934] [Mr. Khalif-ul-lah]

taken as a great relief by me and, I think from the experience that I have got of other mirasidars, and other ryots on a higher and on a lower footing, such a relief would be equally welcome to them.

“ Sir I may say one more word in this connexion. It seems to me that the relief that is given must be an absolute remission and certainly not a suspension of collection merely, because, already the anxiety of the poor ryot is too much for him to bear. There is the money-lender watching him and there are also other things for him to attend to. Let not Government add to the acuteness of his anxiety by adding to it a suspension of tax dangling before him. My humble submission to Government therefore would be that any relief that must be given to the poor ryot must be by way of absolute remission.

“ One hon. Member said that several ryots—though he himself did not believe it—told him that 25 per cent remission would not be a good relief. He closed his speech, however, by saying that he would recommend 18½ per cent relief. I wonder if 18½ per cent remission is in his opinion a substantial relief, whether 25 per cent or more would not be considered by him as a bigger relief. So, taking the entire case, I submit that there is a good case made out for remission and absolute remission being given.

“ One word more, Sir. It has been said that the Government is blind and absolutely heartless in this matter. I have had some discussion, Sir, about this very matter and I must say that the Government is neither blind nor heartless. There is only a difference in view. Government seems to think that remission would not be a proper remedy and that the improvement in nation-building departments would serve as a better remedy. I may say at once that this is not at all a correct view of the present situation. I mean we cannot kill the present ryot and make the position better for the ryot to come. We must see that the ryot that we have is kept in a proper condition before we start making improvements which would be of a permanent nature. The first and foremost requirement to-day is the immediate relief to the ryot actually suffering and such immediate relief can be given only if we grant remission and certainly not by improving the nation-building departments which may in the long run prove advantageous. I therefore think that immediate relief should have preference.”

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—“ Mr. Basheer Ahmed may move his amendment and at the same time confine his remarks to the amendment.”

MR. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—“ I rise to move the amendment of which I have given notice, namely—

*‘ that between the words “ on ” and “ ryotwari ” insert the word “ all ” and, secondly, after the word “ lands ” insert the words “ irrespective of wet or dry ”.’*

“ Sir, the reason why I have thought it fit to give notice of this amendment is this: In the recent communiqué which the Government issued they have shown a differential treatment between wet

[Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed] [30th January 1934]

and dry lands. But, I am afraid, in the communiqué itself they have made out no case against a lower percentage of remission or suspension in the case of dry lands. The prices of crops have admittedly fallen. It cannot be said that they have fallen only in the case of wet crop, viz., paddy and not in the case of dry crops such as ragi, cholam or cumbu and such other products. In fact the prices of dry crops have always kept a certain ratio with those of crops like paddy. Whenever the price of paddy comes down, naturally the demand for this dry crop also comes down and there is an equal degree of fall in the price of dry crops as well. I therefore say, Sir, that the Government is not justified in proposing to suspend only  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per cent in the case of wet crops coming under the area settled after 1918-19 and only  $6\frac{1}{4}$  per cent in the case of dry crops. Sir, there are dry lands which are cultivated with wet crops by Government water. In the case of those lands which are cultivated with wet crop by Government water, I have already moved and the amendment is before the House that the water-rate should also be included for purposes of remission or suspension. I believe, Sir, that the Government have done well in having included water-rate as well, but I would urge upon them the necessity and the justice of giving the same rate of suspension or remission in the case of dry lands as well. All that the Government have stated in their communiqué with regard to dry crops is this:

‘The prices of dry food grains rose similarly, but have not fallen so low.’

“This is a comment which does not comprehend any logic in it. If they have risen along with the wet crops, naturally they must have fallen also in the same ratio as the wet crops. The Government have, however, merely left the matter there and say that they have not fallen so low. All the same there is this admission that the prices of dry crops have fallen. But I submit that the Government have not investigated the extent to which the prices of dry crops have fallen. That being the case, in the absence of any investigation and without having made out a case against giving a similar suspension in the case of dry crops, it is but fair and reasonable that they should also include the dry crops for remission or suspension, whatever that might be.

“Sir, I would now pass on to the amendment that has been given notice of by my hon. Friend from Ganjam and which has been supported so vehemently by the other Friend from Ganjam. I submit that it is not merely Gumsur alone that is situated in a peculiar position. I have brought to the notice of the hon. the Revenue Member the case of those districts that have been very severely affected by the last cyclone—I mean the sad plight of South Arcot and Tanjore. Gumsur is not the only part of the district that has suffered seriously. In the case of certain important taluks in South Arcot and a major portion of Tanjore the condition is still more deplorable. In their cases, if Government merely state that Board’s Standing Orders will be given effect to and that the usual remissions will be given to them, it

30th January 1934] [Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed]

will not be a sufficient or adequate relief. Government have promised at the end of their communiqué that such remissions as may be admissible under the Board's Standing Orders or any other special orders may be passed by the Government. Collections have already commenced and I ask the hon. the Revenue Member as to what special orders the Government have passed or are going to pass. Under the present circumstances almost all crops have failed in the taluks of Chidambaram and Vriddhachalam. It has also been brought to the notice of the Government that Vriddhachalam has been affected by a new pest as well. So, this must receive a greater consideration at the hands of the Government than places like Gumsur. I would ask the hon. the Revenue Member and the Minister in charge to look into this fact and see how this pest has come in that taluk and what steps they have taken to prevent the spread of pest in other neighbouring taluks. I am afraid, if proper remedies are not taken, the pest will spread in the neighbouring taluks and Government will be placed in a worse position than they are at present. As it is, in the Press Communiqué the Government have stated that some concessions have been given to the ryots. I do not see exactly what concessions they have given. They say they have so many proposals under consideration and effect will be given to them in due course. I want to bring to the notice of the hon. the Revenue Member that the several concessions they claim to have given to the ryots have not been given to the ryots in Tanjore and South Arcot by the authorities subordinate to the Government. The Deputy Collectors and the Tahsildars do not allow any concessions allowed by the Government to be enjoyed by the ryots. The latter are not even allowed to take even fallen trees in order to rebuild their houses. I therefore request the hon. the Revenue Member to direct the Deputy Collectors and the Tahsildars to give the ryots such relief as is possible which would not entail any loss to the Government. Even such kind of relief is denied to the ryots of South Arcot. Some poor people have been prosecuted because they took one or two fallen trees to rebuild their houses. In South Arcot prosecutions were launched upon some poor persons for removing small things. I would therefore appeal to the hon. the Revenue Member that there is a case for special treatment being meted out in the case of cyclone affected areas in South Arcot and Tanjore and would ask him to pass early orders giving those ryots some special treatment or extra remission. It will not be enough, if the Government confine themselves merely to Board's Standing Orders. The Board's Standing Orders themselves require revision and it would be desirable if Government would take up revision of those orders as soon as possible, because, as has been pointed out by the ryots of South Arcot and Tanjore, the old system of settlement is not really the right kind of settlement. I do not want to go into that question in detail now. The communiqué has not taken into consideration this aspect of the question. Cultivation to-day calculated even according to Mr. Jackson's report is not profitable. Government's claim of 50 per cent is nearly 115 or 110 or 90 per cent. Statements showing these facts



[Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed] [30th January 1934]

have been asked and furnished by the mirasidars of Chidambaram taluk to the hon. the Revenue Member and the hon. the Finance Member in statements 'A,' 'B' and 'C.' They have shown from the settlement report of Mr. Jackson that the several tarams into which he has classified land do not yield so much profit to ryots. The Government themselves have not examined those statements in their Press Communiqué and have not made any mention of the profitable nature of cultivation. It must be taken for granted in the absence of any contradiction by the hon. the Revenue Member that every taram rate particularly in the lower Coleroon anicut is a rate not warranted by figures and even according to Mr. Jackson's calculation the ryots are working at a minus balance and none of them are making any profit. This, the Press Communiqué has not referred to and it would have been beneficial if Government had included an examination of this aspect of the question as well. I hope the Government will accept or are going to accept 25 per cent or  $18\frac{3}{4}$  per cent remission and include dry assessment also for remission.

"I may, before I conclude, mention that all over the districts there has been a demand for more than 50 per cent reduction. Obviously that seems to be a very reasonable request. The position of the ryots is worse than it was at any other time. Unless 50 per cent reduction is given to them, there will be no real relief to them. But I am not going to press that point. There are so many things in the Press Communiqué which the Government will do well to examine and in the case of Tanjore and South Arcot, I hope they will be pleased to issue special orders giving them a special remission. I therefore move my amendment."

The PATTAGAR OF PALAYAKOTTAI spoke in Tamil seconding the motion.

\* Mr. W. K. M. LANGLEY:—"I had no intention of intervening in this debate, but on reconsideration I thought, there might be some misunderstanding if I did not take part, in view of the fact that I took some part in a similar discussion during last year's budget, and that some explanation might be called for if I did not take part in this particular debate. I am afraid, as far as I am concerned, I cannot accept Mr. Arasu's proposal which recommends a reduction of 25 per cent all round. I cannot support a resolution of that nature. While I am afraid I cannot support such a proposition I ought also to make it plain that I do not speak on behalf of the Group with which I am connected but am speaking for myself. So, it should not be understood that the Group with which I am connected supports a general reduction of 25 per cent in the land revenue assessment. On the other hand I should certainly not like to go so far as Sir A. P. Patro to whom I listened with absolute amazement when he was speaking on this resolution. He appeared to be opposed to this resolution, yet he actually suggested, I believe—Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti has already dealt with it—that land assessment in the case of those who are paying Rs. 10

30th January 1934] [Mr. W. K. M. Langley]

and less should be remitted entirely. I understand that those who pay Rs. 10 and less represented 70 per cent of the ryotwari landholders of the Madras Presidency. So, while I cannot support Mr. Arasu in the matter of reduction of 25 per cent all round, I am afraid it would be still more impossible for me to support Sir Patro's proposal that there should be a general reduction of 70 per cent, a proposition which seems to me to be absolutely barren of statesmanship.

“ Nevertheless, I do feel, and coming from Malabar I could not possibly help feeling, that some measure of relief is called for and to that extent I must express my gratitude for the proposals of Government for the reductions that they have suggested. But I confess that as far as Malabar is concerned—I admit that it is the only district of which I have personal experience—it struck me when the proposals came out that the reductions proposed were extremely meagre. I think last year Malabar was given a reduction of  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per cent on most of its lands. Everybody will tell you in Malabar, and I challenge the Government to ask their own officers—that the condition of Malabar and the condition of prices in Malabar is infinitely worse now than it was a year ago. If it was justifiable to reduce the assessment in Malabar by  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per cent last year, well, I think some larger remission is justifiable on the present occasion. And when I refer to Malabar, I think I can equally speak for South Kanara which is faced with very much the same problems with which Malabar is faced. I expect that most people who have read the papers will recollect an important speech made by H. H. the Zamorin in Calicut itself, in which he stated that he was only able to meet the last assessment through the fortunate fact that he received the Government malikhana just at the same time and was able to meet it out of that. Those who are not so fortunate as to receive malikhana from the Government—you can imagine their condition. It is undoubtedly the fact that the great landholders of Malabar are borrowing money in order to pay their assessment. They deserve every possible consideration at the hands of Government. It is all very well to speak of lands held by investors and not by poor ryots. The land is held in Malabar by the big janmis who have all the responsibilities and none of the advantages of the big zamindars of the East Coast. Where their own tenants cannot meet the assessment, it is notorious that the janmis have to do so on their behalf.

“ My Friend, Mr. Patnaik, has already, I believe, moved an amendment relating to his district or one division of his district. (Interruption.) That is what I am doing. I am not far wrong. If that particular district is impoverished, all I can say in that respect is, if wealth has not accumulated in Goomsur, man has certainly not decayed in a district which has produced two such prominent Members of this House as Sir A. P. Patro and Mr. Patnaik, but if the district is in need of special consideration at the hands of Government, I claim that, if there is any special consideration to be shown to any district, it is only justifiable that it should be shown to my own district of Malabar and its allied district of South Kanara.

[Mr. W. K. M. Langley] [30th January 1934]

"As I have remarked, I am afraid I cannot support the particular resolution before the House. But I would have been glad if the Government had accepted the recommendations of the Finance Committee. On that basis, I think I could have justifiably taken part in any division which might arise. As it is, I am afraid I cannot vote one way or the other.

"As regards the special Government communiqué which was issued some time ago and to which our attention has been forcibly drawn by Government and by most of those who have spoken during this debate, I have read it, I hope, with sufficient care and I have read it several times over. It seems to me that the thing which mainly emerges from this communiqué is that it suggests that the ryotwari system in this Presidency has entirely broken down. I know that the gentleman, under whose signature this communiqué was issued and who made that brilliant speech on behalf of the Government during the last budget session, referred with the deepest respect to Sir Thomas Munroe and others who gave us the ryotwari system. It seems to me that the system, say what you like, is a species of socialism. It is an arrangement by which the Government, after certain deductions took nearly 50 per cent of the yield of the land. That was based on theories which obtained and which were workable 100 years ago when produce was as good as money and in fact, in most parts of the country at any rate, passed as money. The Government, it seems to me, are now in the same position as the United States of America in respect of most of their creditors. They ask their creditors to pay them in a commodity which they simply cannot produce. Their creditors are prepared to give them either goods or services, but they cannot give them what they do not possess, which is gold. In the same way, the Government, under the ryotwari system and the way it is worked to-day, cannot accept their share of the produce in the produce itself. They call upon those who produce the produce to pay their share in something which to the producer, it is not exaggeration to say, is simply unobtainable. It is all very well to refer to the market prices of the produce and so on, but it must be remembered that these prices just like the prices of stocks and shares are the quoted prices so long as the market is not flooded. Now it is notorious that the godowns and warehouses on the East Coast as well as the kalams in Malabar are bulging with paddy at the present moment, which is simply unsaleable. It is all very well to say that paddy sells at so much per garce or so much per para or so much per any other measure you like. It is only worth that so long as there is somebody to buy it at that price. If all the paddy is put on the market simultaneously, it will simply mean that the price will not be so much per para or so much per garce, it would be nil, it would have no value whatsoever. It seems to me that we are facing what may turn into a very serious situation in this Presidency in the matter of this unsaleable produce on which the Government build their hopes for realizing their land revenue. Surely the Government may be faced with a similar situation to what obtains in many of the wheat



30th January 1934] [Mr. W. K. M. Langley]

countries where wheat is being burnt in incinerators in large quantities, because there is a large surplus which has no value whatsoever. Similarly in Brazil where the staple produce is coffee,—my hon. Friends from South Kanara will tell you—it is being burnt at the rate of 10 to 15 million bags per annum. You should look at what is happening in other countries. You may be faced with a similar situation in this Presidency where paddy accumulates to such an extent that it might reach a stage of being definitely unsaleable and large portions of it might have to be taken off the market and destroyed. In that event, any sort of remission that the Government might give would be absolutely valueless. The Government should very seriously and very carefully consider the suggestion that was made on the other side of the House by Mr. Basu Dev who made a most valuable contribution to the debate to-day. I think he suggested that a most careful examination should be made not only of the ryotwari system but also of the whole agricultural system of the Presidency.

“ Now, in this communiqué there is a paragraph which interests me particularly. I confess that some of the earlier paragraphs do not explain very much to a layman like myself, but there is one particular paragraph on which, I think, I do know something and that is the paragraph on page 4 which mentions the measures which Government are proposing to take in order to try and alleviate the situation. Well, I have no hesitation in stating that these particular measures that they propose are almost entirely valueless. It is true that railway rates have to some extent been reduced and to that extent, possibly, some of the mirasidars of Tanjore may be getting a slightly better market for their rice down in Ceylon. The only other suggestion is looking for fresh markets. How can the Government of Madras expect to find new markets for a produce like paddy when the whole of the paddy growing countries of the world, where marketing of paddy is a fine art, cannot find an outlet for it? Let them look at the state of Burma. If there were new markets for paddy, would Burma and Siam not have found them quickly? As it is, the state of Burma as a paddy-growing country is far worse than the state of India. And if the Government of Madras seriously think that they are going to be able to find a new market for their paddy, then, I am afraid they are suffering under a deplorable delusion. Nevertheless . . . (Interruption.) That is what I am coming to—other crops. I am glad to see that I have stung Sir A. P. Patro into a valuable suggestion. That was the suggestion: other crops which might be grown in the place of paddy. I met a friend this morning who is very much interested in agriculture. He deals in an article which is enormously used in this Presidency and all over the world—fertilizers. He was telling me about some striking work which he had inspected only yesterday. It was being carried out by a man who happened to find himself by various accidents in possession of a considerable quantity of land which hitherto had been used only for paddy. He knew that it was no use growing paddy on that particular land; he immediately decided to grow sugarcane on

[Mr. W. K. M. Langley] [30th January 1934]

that land. He was doing that with very striking results and very considerable profit to himself. I put it to this gentleman: when so much of the land now on paddy can be cultivated with sugarcane, why do not the ryots do that? His reply was that the ryots were extremely conservative people, their family system was such that if a bright son proposed the turning of paddy land into sugarcane land, he would be told that what was good enough for his father and grandfather was good enough for him also. The ryots feel a hesitation in altering the ancient system of the family, the principal reason being they have no confidence, feel no certainty as to the future prices for sugarcane. That is hardly surprising, because the price of sugarcane is artificially kept up by the enormous protective tariff on sugar and they feel that these enormous duties might be removed at any moment and the price of sugarcane might slump. The conservative father to whom I have referred would then tell his son, 'well, I told you so.' That is their fear. It seems to me that a great deal might be done by the Agricultural Department to encourage and persuade the ryots to cultivate other crops rather than paddy.

4-15  
p.m.

" Obviously the crop which must strike everybody as being the crop which should be immediately grown, as soon as possible in large quantities, is sugarcane. But the question is whether the Government would definitely arrive at some figure and guarantee the buying rate at a certain figure for a ryot's sugarcane. I do not know if some such guarantee can be given. It seems to me that many thousands of acres in this Presidency, which now are only producing paddy and are not in a position to pay their assessment, can grow very valuable crops like sugarcane, which would enable them to pay their full assessment and the ryots would thus be in a better position to meet the demands of Government from a reliable source of income."

\* Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—" Sir, this is not the first time that Mr. Langley has impressed the House with his lucid and cogent arguments, because whenever he intervenes in debate, he is always able to contribute something to the knowledge of hon. Members of this House. The remedy that he has suggested of growing sugarcane in paddy lands is indeed one that ought to be investigated and his suggestion to have most of the paddy lands converted into lands growing sugarcane deserves every consideration. As has been pointed out by himself, in a place like the United States they have arrived at a situation when they had to give up growing wheat when there was no market to be found for this commodity. We are slowly coming to a situation like that even in this Province. As he pointed out, you may very well say that you have got so much paddy in your hands and so you ought to be able to pay the kist the Government demand. But as he lucidly explained, it is not possible for the ryot to sell that commodity, and the Government want their revenue in money. If the poor agriculturist has to pay revenue, he must naturally borrow by mortgaging his land which now has become less valuable than it was in the old

30th January 1934] [Dr. P. Subbarayan]

days, or by pledging his jewels. My hon. Friend, Mr. Khalif-ul-lah Sahib, pointed that, owing to the rise in the price of gold, that commodity has already gone out of the country—because of the high price that has obtained for gold during the last three or four years. So, here again you have a situation in which the ryot is not in a position even to raise money on credit to pay his kist to the Government. I am thankful to the Government, as other hon. Members of this House were, for the remission that they have granted by the communiqué which they have recently issued. The only point we make is that the remission does not go far enough to alleviate the plight of the agriculturist as it stands to-day. I was rather surprised when, in spite of the arguments Mr. Langley adduced for the remission, he said that he was not in a position to go as far as Mr. Arasu's resolution for remission of 25 per cent. All his arguments on the other hand were really for not only 25 per cent but even more; because he gave other instances to prove that the plight of the agriculturist was such that he was not able to meet the demand of the Government. But he ended by saying that he is not going to vote one way or the other, because he felt that the demand made by Mr. Arasu's resolution went further than he expected.

“ I do not know the reasons which made the Government not to accept the proposals of the Finance Committee. I believe that, when they went before the Finance Committee, they were willing to give reduction by  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per cent on dry lands in the areas that were settled after 1919 and the same rate was to be applied with regard to wet lands. The Finance Committee felt that this did not go far enough as far as wet lands were concerned and therefore they reduced even the Government proposal of  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per cent for dry lands in the recently settled districts to  $6\frac{1}{4}$  per cent and suggested that  $18\frac{3}{4}$  per cent might be given to wet lands in recently settled districts. The Government on the one hand accepted the proposal of the Finance Committee because they found that this will save them a certain amount of money by reducing the suspension of dry rate from  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per cent to  $6\frac{1}{4}$  per cent. After accepting this proposal of the Finance Committee they rejected the further proposal of the Finance Committee which, I believe, was dependent on this. As Mr. Langley pointed out, the owners of wet lands were suffering more than the owners of dry lands in spite of the argument adduced by my hon. Friend, Mr. Basheer Ahmed. There is no doubt that all prices have gone down. The fall in price of wet crops is much more than that of dry crops. My hon. Friend, Mr. Basheer Ahmed, forgets that the assessment which the owner of a wet land has to pay is comparatively more than that which the owner of a dry land has to pay. Therefore, the former deserves a little more reduction than the owner of a dry land. That is the reason why the Members of the Finance Committee came to the conclusion that  $18\frac{3}{4}$  per cent reduction should be given on such lands. I was told on good authority that the remission which is granted now amounts to Rs. 60 lakhs for the fasli year, that is the year beginning from July to the end of June, and that if the  $18\frac{3}{4}$  per cent reduction were accepted, it would be about Rs. 72 lakhs. As my hon. Friend, Mr. Shetti, pointed out, there is a balance



[Dr. P. Subbarayan]

[30th January 1934]

with the Government of Madras of over Rs. 2 crores. The Government replied that there would be demands every year and, if those demands were granted, the balance will not be sufficient to meet the demands of the Legislative Council year after year.

“ At the same time it was also mentioned that, if such remissions are given, it would be impossible to carry on the activities of what they call the nation-building departments. But my answer to this is this. Whatever may be the desire of the people to advance in the matter of education, sanitation, medical relief and industrial pursuits, people have got to live before they can think of these necessary, but not essential, pursuits. Because, when famine faces them and when it is impossible for them to meet even their daily wants, their thoughts of education and sanitation can really not bother them very much. If it is not possible for the Government to collect revenue to the extent that they will be able to carry on the activities of these departments, they must naturally apply the pruning knife to these departments. I think it was one hon. Member—I forget his name for the time being—who said that in spite of the existence of the Agricultural Department and the existence of the hon. the Minister for Development for the last 13 years, the Development Department has developed perhaps in expenditure but has not really developed the activities of the people at all. The hon. Minister who is sitting on that Bench himself pleads guilty to that charge for the simple reason that, even though the researches carried on by the Agricultural Department may be such as to produce two blades of grass where one blade grew, the ryot, as Mr. Langley pointed out, will allow his land, owing to his conservatism, to yield only one blade of grass or even half a blade of grass as he is supposed to do because of the economic situation. Therefore, if that is the experience of the existence of these Development Departments, I would suggest that, if the Government find it difficult to meet the expenditure for these Development Departments, they might stop those activities for the time being. The hon. Minister says ‘abolish.’ He not only agrees with my suggestion but, after the experience of these years, he has come to the definite conclusion that abolition might be the solution of the problem. (Interruption by the hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan.) The hon. Minister has evidently changed his view. Therefore the situation is one that really demands a radical remedy and that radical remedy can only be found by the Government sympathetically considering the demand of the ryots; because, if the ryot is not prosperous, the Government cannot eventually collect the revenue. As Mr. Langley rightly pointed out, if he has no money to pay, if he has no credit that he can get from outside, it will be impossible for the Government even to collect revenue, whatever may be the process they may adopt, because this is an economic proposition. Unless a person is in a position to pay, whatever may be the law and the procedure, you cannot collect money if it does not exist. There will come a time when the ryot will be in such a position that he will not be able to pay the kist whatever may be the situation. Therefore it is but right that the Government, who, I know, have the interests of the people at heart as much as we on this side of the House, should

30th January 1934] [Dr. P. Subbarayan]

come to the rescue of the ryot and view this whole question in a large-hearted manner than a private landholder who is always looking for the money he can get, because he is living on that money, and act as the father of the people whose interests they have at heart and think that in the prosperity of the people lies their own prosperity. Therefore, I am sure that the Government would realize the present economic situation and the dreadful condition of the agriculturist and would see their way to accept the resolution of this House at least to the extent of the recommendation of the Finance Committee which, I hope, they will deeply consider and ponder over before the budget is introduced in this House."

\* Mr. DANIEL THOMAS :—" Mr. President, Sir, after the speeches of the last two hon. Members, Mr. Langley and Dr. Subbarayan, there is really nothing left for me to say. I would make only one suggestion. In the course of the discussion of the issue now before the House various suggestions of far-reaching character have been made. The suggestion made by Mr. Langley and the suggestions made by my hon. Friends, Mr. Basu Dev and Sir Patro, will have to be considered in the years to come. Many far-seeing and statesmanlike suggestions for the improvement of the condition of the agriculturist in this Province will have certainly to be put forward for the proper consideration of the authorities. With regard to the remarks made by Sir Patro, I have one suggestion to make and that is, I do not think that Sir Patro meant that the figure of Rs. 10 pattadar should be a fixed figure. I take it the suggestion he wanted to make to the Government is that in any scheme that may be formulated for the ultimate benefit of the ryots of this country, allowance will have to be made for such ryots as are having income below a certain quota. So far as the income derived from commerce or by following the various professions is concerned, incomes below a certain figure are exempt from taxation. I believe that in the years to come, when the land revenue policy will be placed on a statutory basis, some allowance will have to be made for the peasant proprietors or cultivators whose income fall below a certain figure. It may be that in the years to come our land revenue system may have to be recast or revolutionized on the basis that all incomes of cultivators won't be taxable and that incomes of proprietors and landowners below a certain figure would be exempted from taxation. With reference to the suggestion thrown out by Mr. Basu Dev as regards the solution of the problem of the agriculturists of this Province by finding the necessary marketing facilities for them, that is a question which I believe, will receive the serious attention of the Government and of the public in the years to come. They are all, however, questions of a far-reaching character which are not going to take any shape in the near future. The immediate problem before us, that faces the ryot to-day, is not any of these large questions, but the question as to how he is going to pay the tax for the current fasli, which comes off in March and April. I think all questions of a far-reaching character such as the recasting of the land revenue system or the improvement of the Development departments of Government, etc., or the placing of agriculture on a better basis in this province—all these questions are not going to be taken up now. My

4-30  
p.m.

[Mr. Daniel Thomas]

[30th January 1934]

hon. Friend Mr. Langley, as my Friend Dr. Subbarayan pointed out, has painted in very realistic colours the desperate condition of the ryot and also added that he was not in a position to vote for the 25 per cent reduction which is asked for in this resolution. At the same time, he pleaded that for Malabar and South Kanara special considerations should be shown. We have some time back had an amendment by my Friend Mr. Patnaik, who stated that for the Goomsur division in Ganjam district, a special reduction of 50 per cent should be made. I believe that every Member of this House who represents any area will be able to convince this House that his particular area deserves special treatment. The ultimate result of every Member claiming a reduction of 50 per cent for his district will be that a uniform rate of 50 per cent remission should be allowed to all the districts of the Province. But all of us do not want to go so far; in regard to my own district of Tinnevely, I can make the same claim and I can prove it by facts and figures. I received only the other day some facts and figures from a highly placed retired Government servant. He said he owned  $1\frac{1}{2}$  acres of wet land in Kallidaikurichi of the Ambasamudram taluk of Tinnevely, one of the most fertile areas in the Tambraparni Irrigation System in our district. He said that the kist for that area of  $1\frac{1}{2}$  acres was Rs. 29 and odd. My Friend from South Kanara claimed that his district was the heaviest taxed district in the province. I think I can claim that Tinnevely is the heaviest taxed district. That gentleman, as I said, was paying a kist of Rs. 29 and odd. The year before last he had an income from that land of about Rs. 39, and that was the net income. So, out of it he paid Rs. 29 towards kist and profited to the extent of Rs. 10. That was the position year before last; but in the current year, the total income that he derived from his land was only Rs. 19 and odd and he told me—he is a pensioner of the Madras Government drawing a fairly large amount as pension—that out of the pension that he received, he made good the deficit of Rs. 10 and paid the kist for the land. That may very well be nothing for a Government servant drawing a large pension, but what about the ordinary ryot, I ask? The ordinary ryot who has no pension or any other resources to fall back upon, whose condition was so aptly described by my Friend, Mr. Langley, what is he to do? Where is he to get the money from for paying the Government kist? I am only reminded of that old story which I read in my school days, about half the profits. A man carried a large fish into a palace with a view to get presents, but the gate-keeper claimed half the profits. The man consented and when he was asked what he wanted, he said he wanted 100 lashes, so that half of them may go to the gate-keeper. Similarly here, if the Government claim 50 per cent of the profits and if the ryot has no profits at all but is faced with a deficit, will the Government share with the ryot one-half of his deficit? That is the logical way in which the question should be solved now. I do not however want to stand on mere logic; I believe the Government are fully appraised of the situation of the ryots in all parts of the Province. I believe, as my Friend, Dr. Subbarayan, said, the Government are not less backward than any of us in this House in considering the actual relief and measures of amelioration necessary for the ryot. I take it that both the Government



30th January 1934] [Mr. Daniel Thomas]

and we are agreed that the ryot does stand in need of relief to the extent not only of 25 per cent, but more. We ask for only 25 per cent, because we claim that that is a reasonable claim which the Government, by adjusting its finances, would be able to meet in the present circumstances. The Government agree that the ryot does stand in need of 25 per cent relief. The only difference between us is whether the 25 per cent reduction, which will probably result in Rs.  $1\frac{1}{2}$  crores of revenue remission, can be made good from other sources. On that matter, my Friend, Mr. Shetty, has very well pointed out that there are various sources from which this amount can be met. It could be met from three sources, from the opening balances, through observing economy in Part II Schemes, and by having a graded cut in the salaries of Government officials. My Friend, Mr. Shetty, also referred to this aspect of the question, in some detail. If you take the salaries of public servants of the Province as they stand to-day and as they stood before the year 1914, I believe the present figures come to something like double the figures for 1914. If you again take the position of a Government servant before 1914 drawing a certain salary, and if you take a man who was making out his livelihood by other professions such as commerce, agriculture or industries and if you take the same people now, you will see that a vast change has taken place in their respective positions to-day. The Government servant drawing Rs. 100 or Rs. 200 in 1914 is at the present day enjoying practically twice the advantages that he enjoyed in 1914; whereas the agriculturist or the industrialist or the trader or other professional man who was getting Rs. 100 or Rs. 200 in 1914 is hardly able to make both ends meet, and his income is hardly one-half, as compared to 1914. I believe this is a reasonable statement. Some of my Friends say that the Government servants will themselves be coming forward to accept this cut, as a self-denying ordinance. But human nature is not after all so generous in a matter affecting financial matters. I would say it is not unreasonable to expect that when the whole province is so hard hit, when every section of the population, agriculturist, industrialist, professional men, etc., is suffering badly, the public servant also should come in for his share and should be made to contribute his quota towards restoring a better financial equilibrium in our Province.

"Then, Sir, I have only one other suggestion to make to the hon. the Revenue Member. In the matter of concessions which have been allowed by the Government thus far, a distinction is sought to be made between certain districts which were recently resettled and certain others which were settled earlier. I think the figures on which such distinctions are made are not quite accurate. Whatever may have been the difference in prices between the times of the first and the next settlements, no increase has been made anywhere, of over  $18\frac{3}{4}$  per cent.  $18\frac{3}{4}$  per cent is the maximum rate of increase in any district. In Tinnevely the settlement was made in 1910 or so, and an increase of  $18\frac{3}{4}$  per cent was made; in Tanjore which was settled some years ago, the increase was the same  $18\frac{3}{4}$  per cent. So, I say, whatever was the difference in prices between one settlement and another, the maximum increase is only  $18\frac{3}{4}$  per cent.

[Mr. Daniel Thomas] [30th January 1934]

So far as the actual rate of increase for Tinnevely or Tanjore is concerned, the rate is the same. Similarly in the case of other districts, and nowhere has the maximum increase been more than 18½ per cent. This fact will have to be taken into consideration in regard to the other districts which claim a similar concession now. I would submit that taking the conditions as they are at present, there is practically no difference between district and district in the matter of the distress suffered; the ryots in all the districts are very badly off. I would submit that the wise policy and the large-hearted policy of the Government should be to make no distinction between one district and another and to see that this concession is made available equally to all the districts."

\* Mr. K. KOTI REDDI:—"Mr. President, Sir, if I rise now to support this motion, it is not because I think I can augment the arguments and the information that have already been brought to bear in support of this resolution, but because I think Government have not really realized the situation of the ryot in this Presidency and therefore it is the bounden duty of each one of us here to express what he feels about the resolution and to bring to the notice of the Government, if they can be convinced, the dire consequences that would follow as a result of the Government not accepting this resolution, this modest proposal of 25 per cent remission, as I should put it, in the present circumstances. Before going into the question in detail, I would like to bring to the notice of the Government one or two facts within my own knowledge. There have been many Members here who have already spoken and who gave information to the Government, not from direct knowledge but from information derived from the ryots. I claim, Sir, to be an actual cultivating ryot and I can give information to the Government with regard to the profits that are made out of cultivation, information which I have in my possession, accompanied by facts and figures. If the Government care to go into those facts and figures and the accounts that I am keeping, they will know what a landowner is making as profits out of his land. Sir, it is said that the position of the dry land is a little better than the position of the wet land. I am acquainted with both kinds of lands; but I believe the position of the dry land is not in any way better than that of the wet land. Both of them stand on the same footing of a profitless concern.

4-45  
P.m.

"Sir, I have got an account of the money that I have got out of the cultivation of my lands covering about 200 acres of dry land for the last four years. I have not brought them here, but if Government cares I shall send for them and let them go through them and find out what is it that I have realized from the cultivation of those lands. The amount that I have made, I may say, is a very big zero even without paying anything to the manager who is looking after the cultivation. That is the state of affairs that actually exists in this Presidency at the present moment. Government may easily say that the position is not so bad as that. It is notorious that the ryot is so fond of his land that he is even prepared to sell away whatever he has for meeting Government revenue. As a matter of fact, for the last three or four years, in order to raise the amount necessary for paying the revenue due to Government, and for

30th January 1934] [Mr. K. Koti Reddi]

meeting other necessary expenditure, the ryots have sold away almost all their jewels. On another occasion last year I have pointed out the desirability of investigating how much gold has been sold away by the ryots in order to pay the revenue and how much of their jewels have been pledged with money-lenders including the Imperial Bank for this purpose. Government do not seem to have cared to investigate. Only recently the Government of India has come forward and appointed some experts from England to investigate into the question and to make an economic survey of this big country including, I believe, the Madras Presidency. What the result of that investigation will be, I do not know. But I can say only this, that though the Government may wait for the result of that investigation the ryot cannot. The point that we have to immediately consider is how the ryot is going to meet Government revenue. He has sold away his jewels already. If he is able to raise a loan, he is certainly prepared to do so and pay the revenue, but it is a well-known fact that in many districts—at least so far as the district with which I am acquainted is concerned—the ryot has no credit. No money-lender is prepared to lend him money even though the ryot is prepared to take it at an exorbitant rate of interest, unless jewels are pledged with him, which the ryot has not got, for he has sold away whatever he had last year. That is his position.

“Now, let us consider the prices that are ruling at present. I have some knowledge of the actual prices of some of the produce from lands. In regard to groundnut, it is rather unfortunate that Government do not seem to keep an account of prices of groundnut, for I do not find in any report any information about the prices of groundnut in various districts. For this one has only to rely on the information given in newspapers. In the years 1916, 1917 and 1918, the price of groundnut per maund was about Rs. 1-6-0, but subsequent to that prices rose. I remember I actually sold in one year at Rs. 3 per maund. In many years it was more than Rs. 2 varying between Rs. 2 and Rs. 2-8-0 and it would certainly be much more in places which are very near the markets. I am speaking of a place which is 26 miles from the nearest railway station. Now, what is the price? Last year at about November or December it began with 11 annas and never rose beyond 13 annas. The year before last, it was much better, it began with 12 annas and went up to Rs. 1-8-0, and there was a sudden rise of prices—I do not know the reason, probably it was due to the shortage of production. But this year, the price began with 5 annas to 6 annas per maund fresh from ground and after some time it went up to 8 annas or 9 annas and now the price is 10 annas. One has only to compare 8 annas or 9 annas with Rs. 2 or Rs. 2-8-0. In this connection, we have to take into account the price of seed and the cost of harvesting which alone would even now be at least 5 annas to 6 annas per maund and various other expenses. I leave it to Government to think what will be the consequences of a state of things like this.

“So far with regard to groundnut which has been the chief commercial crop in both the black cotton and red soil tracts. For the last ten years, groundnut has practically taken the place of cotton as the first



[Mr. K. Koti Reddi]

[30th January 1934]

commercial crop. Then, with regard to cotton itself, the position is not in any way much better. Though I am not so much acquainted with the prices of cotton, yet I have some knowledge of this also. In 1918 and subsequent years the price was about Rs. 250 or Rs. 300 and it went up even to Rs. 500 per kanttam, but anyway the average price of cotton was not less than Rs. 200, but last year and one or two years previous the price never went beyond Rs. 80 and it is the same to-day, I believe. No doubt as a result of the Japanese agreement, the price has gone up a bit but has not materially increased.

"Then, with regard to cholam, the position is much the same. In this case also, in the year 1918, the price of one putti, i.e., 640 Madras measures, was about Rs. 140, and for some years after at any rate it did not go below Rs. 120. For the last two years, the price is only Rs. 40 and to-day I am told it is somewhere about Rs. 33. That is the state of affairs to-day."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The hon. Member has already exceeded the time-limit."

\* Mr. K. KOTI REDDI:—"With regard to the interesting question that has been raised as to the reform that would probably be necessary with regard to the land revenue settlement, I am also very much interested, but I believe the time at my disposal is short to deal with it now, and I do not therefore propose to discuss the question. Whatever it may be, we are now bringing to the notice of the Government the extraordinary position which the ryot now occupies. He has practically no resource for him to pay the land revenue, and unless the Government comes to his rescue, one cannot realize what his position will be in the future. Probably Government will have to take up all the land which they have been claiming as theirs. The position of the agricultural labourer to-day is much better than that of a ryot, for he has to pay both to the labourer as well as to the Government and the wages of labour have not gone down in proportion to the decrease in the price of commodities. It has been said that if we can ask the Government to make a distinction between a big and a small ryot there is a better chance of getting the sympathy of the Government. As regards the person owning a large extent of land, as I have already shown, nothing remains to him after paying the Government, but the small ryot who actually cultivates his own land makes something because it is the wages of his own labour, but even then there is not much left for him to meet his other expenses. I would certainly welcome, as suggested by some hon. Member, if a distinction is made between the small pattadar and a big ryot or a big landholder. If Government are prepared to accept that suggestion, personally I would be satisfied. An ordinary pattadar who pays Rs. 50 and less, even according to Government's own calculation, cannot be making annually much profit and, if Government is prepared to give full remission to all such pattadars, let them not give any remission to the others. Will they do it?"

30th January 1934]

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I hope the hon. Member will conclude his speech.”

\* Mr. K. KOTI REDDI :—“ There are a number of sources by which, if only the Government have a will, they can get the amount necessary to give relief to the ryot. Other Governments had the will and they have been doing it, and other countries are taking measures in order to meet the situation that has arisen on account of the economic depression. If this Government can be convinced to take a sympathetic attitude towards the ryot who pays the Government, let them come to his rescue immediately instead of killing the goose that lays the golden eggs. There are many ways by which they can meet the present situation. They can remit 25 per cent and I am sure even if they remit 50 per cent it would not be much. As a matter of fact, even to-day I received a petition from the ryots of my district bemoaning of their condition and asking me to take the petition to His Excellency the Governor and make proper representations on their behalf. What the ryot in the village is keenly feeling is, when he, who pays every one, is actually suffering, how can this heartless Government pay such high salaries to Government officials. When the prices of commodities went up and this Government proposed increase of salaries, this Council did not grudge to increase the salaries of officers and when the prices come down—not twofold but even fourfold,—is it not fair for us to expect these officers to share the distress of the ryot, not merely by a 10 per cent cut, but even much more than that in order to help the ryot who has helped him in times of need? That is the direction in which Government ought to proceed first; and if they cannot do that, there is the surplus. If such surplus cannot be utilized on an occasion like the present when there is so much distress, what is the use of that? I do not think a better occasion would come to the Government to use the large surpluses at the disposal of the Government.

“ I can suggest some other sources but as the time at my disposal is very short, I can only appeal to the Government to have some heart for the ryot who has been helping the Government and everybody.”

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Further discussion upon this resolution will continue to-morrow.”

The House then adjourned to meet again at 11 a.m. the next day.

#### XIII.—PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE.

*U.O. Note a No. 6766-C-5, dated 22nd January 1934, with reference to the answer to the supplementary question to Legislative Council Question No. 410 answered on 8th November 1933.*

R. V. KRISHNA AYYAR,  
Secretary to the Legislative Council.

[30th January 1934]

## APPENDIX I.

[Vide answer to question No. 543 asked by Mrs. K. Alamelumangathayamma at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 30th January 1934, page 131 supra.]

*Statement showing the daily average attendance of patients in the Out-patient department of the Government Hospital, Sivaganga, from 19th June 1931 to 31st October 1933.*

| Year. | Months.           | Males. | Females. | Children,<br>both males<br>and females. |
|-------|-------------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------------|
| 1931  | June .. .. .      | 31.66  | 2.16     | 20.24                                   |
|       | July .. .. .      | 31.29  | 16.45    | 26.32                                   |
|       | August .. .. .    | 32.26  | 13.39    | 25.38                                   |
|       | September .. .. . | 34.80  | 14.60    | 20.80                                   |
|       | October .. .. .   | 28.81  | 13.13    | 15.06                                   |
|       | November .. .. .  | 27.73  | 16.06    | 24.29                                   |
| 1932  | December .. .. .  | 26.42  | 19.39    | 21.06                                   |
|       | January .. .. .   | 28.03  | 20.03    | 16.71                                   |
|       | February .. .. .  | 33.28  | 12.97    | 17.00                                   |
|       | March .. .. .     | 30.42  | 13.10    | 14.06                                   |
|       | April .. .. .     | 36.80  | 17.97    | 19.93                                   |
|       | May .. .. .       | 54.22  | 25.74    | 34.81                                   |
|       | June .. .. .      | 56.90  | 27.33    | 32.57                                   |
|       | July .. .. .      | 72.74  | 29.20    | 42.06                                   |
|       | August .. .. .    | 63.13  | 28.52    | 38.38                                   |
|       | September .. .. . | 52.46  | 27.40    | 30.92                                   |
|       | October .. .. .   | 55.81  | 27.06    | 30.98                                   |
|       | November .. .. .  | 60.03  | 26.57    | 25.64                                   |
| 1933  | December .. .. .  | 56.61  | 25.91    | 24.41                                   |
|       | January .. .. .   | 59.35  | 26.44    | 25.46                                   |
|       | February .. .. .  | 59.14  | 28.94    | 26.70                                   |
|       | March .. .. .     | 59.71  | 27.84    | 29.09                                   |
|       | April .. .. .     | 63.80  | 21.40    | 22.95                                   |
|       | May .. .. .       | 69.75  | 24.69    | 37.07                                   |
|       | June .. .. .      | 69.11  | 27.41    | 29.66                                   |
|       | July .. .. .      | 62.39  | 26.37    | 25.05                                   |
|       | August .. .. .    | 66.76  | 31.65    | 29.77                                   |
|       | September .. .. . | 87.40  | 35.88    | 32.89                                   |
|       | October .. .. .   | 93.92  | 42.00    | 35.45                                   |



30th January 1934]

## APPENDIX II.

[Vide answer to question No. 551 asked by Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 30th January 1934, page 137 supra.]

*Statement referred to in answer to clause (c) of the Legislative Council Question No. 779.\**

| Officers from whom report was received. | Appointment for which applications were made.              | Number of rejected applications from ex-army men. | Reasons for rejection.                                                                                                                                                                          |
|-----------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 Collector of Malabar                  | .. Kolkaran, Eruvetti amsam.                               | 2                                                 | (i) Applicants resigned their previous appointments in the Malabar Special Police.<br>(ii) In regard to the appointment of village officers, the rule generally followed is that of succession. |
| 2 Do.                                   | .. Adhigari, Areacode amsam (temporary).                   | 1                                                 | Applicant has neither house nor property in Areacode amsam.                                                                                                                                     |
| 3 Collector of North Arcot              | .. Clerk or accountant.                                    | 1                                                 | Not qualified for employment under the ministerial service rules.                                                                                                                               |
| 4 Collector of Madura                   | .. Peon .. ..                                              | 1                                                 | Applicant was reported to be lazy and indifferent.                                                                                                                                              |
| 5 Collector of North Arcot              | .. Clerk .. ..                                             | 1                                                 | Not qualified for employment under the ministerial service rules.                                                                                                                               |
| 6 Sub-Collector, Chandragiri..          | .. Dalayat .. ..                                           | 5                                                 | Vacancy filled up by one who had put in 6½ years service with reference to paragraph 3 of G.O. No. 415, Public, dated 26th March 1930.                                                          |
| 7 Collector of Malabar                  | .. Kolkaran, Makreri amsam.                                | 2                                                 | Rule generally followed in regard to appointment of village officers is that of succession.                                                                                                     |
| 8 District Judge of Madura              | .. Appointment in District Court.                          | 1                                                 | Discharged from the army for inefficiency.                                                                                                                                                      |
| 9 District Judge of Salem               | .. Dalayat (temporary), District Munsif's Court, Namakkal. | 4                                                 | Did not appear for interview on the stipulated date (one of the four was however appointed subsequently.)                                                                                       |

[30th January 1934]

## APPENDIX III.

[Vide answer to question No. 553 asked by Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 30th January 1934, page 138 supra.]

*A memorandum from the Landholders' Association, South Kanara, Mangalore.*

To the Hon'ble Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR,  
Law Member, Government of Madras.

SIR,

[Forest—Reserves in South Kanara—Withdrawal of concessions.]

Since Government have taken the extreme step of withdrawing the concessions or privileges which the ryots enjoyed hitherto in twelve reserve forests of the North Mangalore division and one reserve forest in the South Mangalore division of this district since 1st April 1933, several meetings of the ryots have been held and memorials and petitions have been submitted to Government from various quarters including this association protesting against the said withdrawal but the association keenly regrets to find that Government have not yet been pleased to cancel the same.

2. Amongst the various meetings so held since 1st April 1933 an important meeting was held under the auspices of this association at Kirimanjeshwar in the Coondapoor taluk on the 8th of October last, when Mr. A. B. Shetty, M.L.C., a member of the Executive Committee of the Association, and Mr. K. R. Karant, its Secretary, were specially present. One hundred and forty ryots representing as many as 21 villages of the north and north-west portions of the Coondapoor taluk were present. The question of the withdrawal was discussed in all its aspects and the resolutions passed at the said meeting have amongst others been considered by the executive committee of the association at their meetings held at Mangalore on the 15th and the 22nd of October 1933. The tale of woe and suffering expressed, at the said meeting of Kirimanjeshwar by the ryots present on account of the withdrawal of the concessions, to the said representatives of the association was truly heartrending.

3. The committee has at the said meetings also discussed the reports of the Conservator of Forests and the Chief Conservator of Forests printed and laid on the table of the Legislative Council with reference to the supplementary question to question No. 73 asked at the meeting of the Council on 2nd August 1933. After deeply considering the above as well as the various representations received by the association regarding the withdrawal from the ryots of the concerned areas the executive committee have authorized the secretary to submit this memorandum on

30th January 1934]

behalf of the association to Government and have also authorized Diwan Bahadur B. Mahabala Hegde, B.A., B.L., President of the Association, to interview the Hon'ble the Law Member at Madras and supplement this memorandum as may be necessary.

4. It is to be highly regretted that in the matter of the withdrawal of the concessions which has hit hard the lives and well-being, or more truly the struggle for existence, of thousands of people solely depending upon cultivation in the numerous villages in which the aforesaid reserves are situated, and in which the said concessions have been withdrawn since 1st April 1933; and even though the position of the ryots has become almost desperate, both on account of the withdrawal as also on account of the keen economic depression prevailing in the district, Government should be turning a deaf ear to all representations. It is indeed sad that in this matter the one-sided reports of the Forest department which, it is respectfully submitted, appear to have absolutely no feeling towards the ryots concerned, and the sole objects of which appear to be to advance the theory and science of forest conservancy and its revenue regardless of all practical considerations, should outweigh with Government the fortunes and miseries of thousands of these cultivators.

5. In taking the drastic step which Government have done, the association respectfully ask Government whether they have seriously considered the following questions. Have they cared to make an enquiry on the spot as to how many thousands of families are depending for their livelihood entirely upon agriculture in the numerous villages in which the concessions are now closed? Have these people any other means of substituting the numerous needs, which till now they have been getting from these reserves, for the vast quantities of green and dry leaves for their manure, grass for the fodder of their cattle, fuel for their agricultural and domestic needs, etc.? Has anyone, before closing these concessions, as if by a stroke of the pen, ever practically demonstrated to them or shown to them there are other ways in which their needs could be satisfied? Will Government be pleased even now to ascertain the thousands of rupees in the shape of land revenue and cesses which they are obliged to pay Government year after year? Is it not worthwhile making an enquiry as to how they are to cultivate their lands in the absence of these vital necessities, make a living out of cultivation, and yet continue to pay assessment to the Revenue department? Are the Forest department of Government and its own Revenue department so divorced from each other that the former does not care as to how the latter is to collect its revenue? Have Government ever paid serious heed to the ever increasing demands of more and more population living in these areas which are coastal parts of the district? The reserves in question were constituted some 30 or 40 years ago at a time when population was very much less and the needs of cultivation also much less than now. Since that time both have increased, if the association is not mistaken, by more than 50 per cent and yet in all this period, far from trying to meet the ever increasing demands of both, making more and more lands available out of these reserves for the purposes, and



[30th January 1934]

absolute purposes too, of cultivation and also lessening the rigours of the forest laws to suit such needs, the attempt seems to be the other way, namely, to curtail cultivation, to increase the extent of reserves in these thickly populated areas, to afforest for the first time even to-day fresh reserves in them and thereby render cultivation almost impossible. Will Government be pleased to order a survey, even on an approximate scale, if not for all the villages concerned, at least for a few typical amongst them of the various hardships and miseries and losses which are caused to the ryots of these villages, day-in and day-out, on account of the reserve forests of the Government? How many thousands of valuable cattle which is the best portion of the wealth of these cultivators is being destroyed year after year by the tigers and panthers abounding in these forests! In practically every field growing a crop in the villages concerned a good portion of the same is devoured and devastated by the wild bears, monkeys and various other kinds of animals that are infesting the forests and which are increasing in numbers year by year. And what of the enormous sufferings these poor people are put to on account of the ever increasing malaria which has become a permanent factor in these regions! Will Government be pleased to call for figures, let alone of cattle, of men, women and children in the villages concerned, apart from other affected portions of the district where the case is much worse, what not even human life is safe, of the men, women and children who are killed or mauled by the tigers and panthers in these areas? Particularly in the Coondapoor taluk, since the last six months, this trouble seems to have increased all of a sudden and it is high time that Government took note of these and allied matters. The association has heard of a society being formed at Madras for the preservation of wild life. Is it not far more important that something is done to set afoot an organization for the preservation of the very lives of these cultivators and of their cattle which after all have some claim upon the Government?

6. Quite recently a much revered and respected Catholic priest living in one of the villages, wherein these concessions have been withdrawn, has written as follows to a member of the association:—" . . . They (the menials of the Forest department) give too much trouble to the villagers and extort money and if their thirst is not quenched make false cases and add to the weight of the forest laws which are already unbearable. I am not a prophet. Yet I can foresee that people will not be able to live around these reserves after some years. Their crops are destroyed by wild animals. Their livestock is reduced by the panthers and tigers. Yet the Government is merciless. It is a pure tyranny." People sitting at Madras or the high-placed officials of the Forest department may laugh at this! And yet, anyone with a heart and who has an intimate knowledge of the forest areas of this district cannot say that the condition of things spoken to by this sincere and disinterested priest is anything but true and correct. Sir, even worms are said to turn. But it may be only in proverbs. If elsewhere they do not and cannot, is it really worthwhile for the Government to

30th January 1934]

tread and kill them beyond all hope of recovery or redemption? Have the cultivators of this area no claim at all to a more human existence, let alone a decent one?

7. Dealing specifically with some of the important points noticed by the Conservator of Forests in his report referred to above, he appears to think that these reserves are being used and exploited only by the 'vociferous landlords' and not by the actual cultivators. This is an entirely mistaken idea. The well-to-do landholders who have their own 'hadies' or petty forests, which the Conservator refers to, are few and far between. It is not every ryot in a village, or even a landlord who has some tenants under him, that can afford to own a 'hadi' in these areas. The hundreds and thousands of petty landholders or the much numerous class of the chalgani tenants (tenants from year to year) have no 'hadies' whatever to draw upon for their requirements. The association does not believe that it has ever been the case of the Forest department that the thousands of the villagers, mostly actual cultivators, if not paid coolies, walk every day to and from anything between 5 to 10 miles, to obtain and carry headloads of these manure leaves or fuel to sell them to others. If that is not the case and if people have ample leaves in their own 'hadies,' as the Conservator seems to assume, why should these people put themselves to all this trouble?

8. Another remark of the Conservator is that these concessions have been largely abused in certain parts of the district. As regards the general charge of abuse, whilst the association will not deny some abuses here and there which are in the nature of things inevitable, it emphatically denies that it exists to the enormous extent which the department would try to make out. In fact the Conservator himself admits that to some extent such abuses are inevitable, that the rules are indefinite, that their practical application is more difficult and that therefore some amount of abuse is bound to exist. The association would however submit that if due and proper allowance is to be made for the large demands of thousands of acres of cultivation that depend solely upon these concessions and for the very great needs of the domestic lives of thousands of families living in these vast areas the so-called abuses are surely not serious. It is rather unfortunate that in considering the question of these abuses the mind of the Conservator should have been prejudiced by the lawlessness of the northern portions of Coondapoor taluk. One imagines that this has reference to the civil disobedience activities last year in respect of some of these reserves. The association deeply regrets the activities in respect of such forests by some of the persons concerned. But can anyone say that the wholesale populations of these areas have taken part in these activities? Otherwise it would be wrong to penalize the entire people of these areas for the misguided activities of a few.

9. Speaking of these abuses the Conservator himself admits that in certain parts, as for instance the Mandakole reserve, the abuses of the concessions have greatly abated after the District Forest Officer had an

[30th January 1934]

interview with the villagers. The Forest Administration Report for 1930-31, Volume I, paragraph 113, would show that the forest village system including the Todar and Hosabettu reserves of the North Mangalore division has worked satisfactorily. And yet these concessions are withdrawn on 1st April 1933 also in those two reserves. Is it credible that in this short interval extraordinary abuses could have taken place? This association does not think so.

10. On the other hand there lurks in the mind of the association a shrewd suspicion that the story of these abuses with respect to most, if not all, of the reserves in question, is really the result of a deliberate change of policy with respect to these reserves by the Forest department. It has been repeatedly stated in the past on behalf of Government that the reserves in question as well as others called "Ryots' Forests" are intended mainly to supply the agricultural and domestic needs of the ryots residing in their vicinity. On 16th March 1928, Sir Archibald Campbell spoke as follows in the Legislative Council (vide Council Proceedings, Volume 41, page 242):—"The forests of the province are classified into two classes, the Provincial Forests and the Ryots' Forests. The Provincial Forests include those which it is desirable to work commercially and for which as much revenue as possible could be obtained. The Ryots' Forests are those which are near villages and are not so important commercially but are important to the local people." Said Sir Thomas Moir, some time earlier, in the Legislative Council (vide Council Proceedings, Volume 35, page 304):—"We do not forget and have never forgotten that its (the Forest department's) main object is to supply the needs of the people and it must pay attention to the fact that the ryots do require fuel, that they require timber for houses, that they require implements for agriculture and that they require grazing for their cattle." The words of the memorable resolution of the Government of India on the forest policy of the Government stated so long ago as 1894 are still more clear and stand amidst much of the present trouble and darkness, as a beacon light. It is printed in the Forest Code obviously as the guiding star to the department. But the present attempt of the department in closing the concessions altogether in some of the reserves and threatening to close them entirely in all the reserves of this district in the immediate future seems to show as if the wise words of the above resolution are no longer to be respected. In a word, it looks as if so far at any rate the people of this district are concerned, hereafter, the people are to exist entirely at the mercy of the Forest department and not that the Forest department is to exist for serving the needs of the people.

11. Even at the risk of repeating the relevant portions of the above resolution the association craves leave to quote them:—"The needs of communities dwelling on the margin of forest tracts consist mainly in small timber for building, wood for fuel, leaves for manure and for fodder, thorns for fencing, grass and grazing for cattle and edible forest produce for their own consumption. Every reasonable facility



30th January 1934]

should be afforded to the people concerned for the full and easy satisfaction of these needs. It should be distinctly understood that considerations of forest income are to be subordinated to that satisfaction. . . . It should also be remembered that, subject to certain conditions to be referred to presently, the claims of cultivation are stronger than the claims of forest preservation. . . . Such restrictions as may be necessary for the preservation of the forest or for the better enjoyment of its benefits should be imposed. But no restrictions should be placed upon reasonable local demands merely in order to increase the State revenues. . . . The inferior subordinates of the Forest department are perhaps as reliable as can be expected on the pay which we can afford to give, but their morality is no higher than that of the uneducated class from which they are drawn, while the enormous areas over which they are scattered and the small number of controlling staff render effective supervision most difficult. It is not right in order to protect the grass or grazing dues on plots of wastes scattered over the cultivated district, to put it into the power of an underling to pound or threaten to pound cattle on the plea that they have overstepped the boundary between their owners' field and the next. It is to be distinctly understood that the Government of India do not desire that the grazing should be looked upon primarily as a source of revenue." To close the reserves for the just and necessary satisfaction of the several needs of the cultivators in this district as Government have done by their withdrawal of the concessions since 1st April last, and to threaten to do so in all the reserve forests in the extremely hilly and forest areas of this district is to give the complete go-by to the aforesaid resolution of the Government of India and the openly acknowledged policy of this Government itself hitherto, and it is respectfully submitted, a clear breach of faith. The attempt on the part of the Forest department in this district appears to be not to exploit the vast extent of the dense, the first rate and primeval forests situated on the ghaut and sub-ghaut regions of this district from one end to the other, as they deserve to, and ought to, be exploited commercially, but to leave them practically untouched, and on the other hand to change the ryots' forests which have all along been held out to be ryots' forests where only fuel was to be got into sandalwood and other kinds of exploitation forests, and for this purpose to close them entirely to the people and deny them all their legitimate needs irrespective of all considerations of justice and common humanity. Otherwise what right or justice is there in closing a reserve like the Thodar or Hosabettu situated amidst thousands of cultivators into sandalwood forests? Will the Forest department be pleased to state the total net revenue that they have been able to provide the Government with ever since the department was started in respect of the reserves with which we are now concerned as against the revenue paid in this period in the shape of land revenue and cesses by the people in the villages concerned and vastly more than this the terrible and stupendous losses which the people have suffered by reason of the devastation of their cattle and crops,

[30th January 1934]

direct and indirect, solely due to the proximity of the reserves in question? If figures are forthcoming it will no doubt be found that the former is practically nothing compared with the latter.

12. Before leaving the question of these abuses finally, this association has repeatedly represented in the past that there is no use of compiling an impractical list of as many as 35 species of prohibited and classified trees from which leaves and twigs shall not be removed but which list cannot be known or remembered by even many of the forest guards or foresters and which has been compiled irrespective of the sufficiency or otherwise of other species that would be necessary to satisfy the legitimate demands of the cultivators.

13. Whilst the Forest department appears to have been always anxious to point out and emphasize abuses of concessions on the part of the illiterate and ignorant villagers, will the department show an equal anxiety to look into the record of its own subordinates who have been, to some extent at least, responsible for some of these abuses? It is an open secret that in almost every part of the district wherever there are the reserves the villagers are practically compelled to submit themselves to almost a systematized form of corruption either for the very use of these concessions on the part of the people or for being saved from the tyranny of false and manipulated forest cases. In fact even in the case of the very reserves which are now closed and which form the main object of this memorandum one could find that still certain people in many of these villages are being allowed to remove manure leaves and fuel, but only the charges levied are much more excessive than used to be extorted in the past. The association does not wish it to be understood that it sympathizes in the least with the ryots who have recourse to such unlawful means though it cannot but regret the existence of circumstances which drive them to such a course. To the Forest department it would, however, say that some amount of self-introspection would not be entirely out of place.

14. There is one matter in the report of the Chief Conservator of Forests referred to above which would require some elucidation. It appears therefrom that the proposal is to close the reserves for these concessions in the interior of the district and then to work towards the sea where the demand is admittedly the heaviest. But unfortunately the reserves now closed are all the coastal reserves and not the interior ones at all. Every one of these reserves is situated as already stated above amidst largely cultivated and thickly populated villages. How happens it then that the process instead of commencing from the interior towards the sea is working in the opposite direction?

15. There is one remark, if it cannot be called also an argument, of the Conservator in his report referred to above which requires an answer. He says that South Kanara is setting up 'awkward precedents' and wants to know as to why it should get the concessions free. Herein lies most of the misfortune of this district. The Forest Officers who come to this district and are transferred almost every year or every other year are

30th January 1934]

absolutely ignorant of the past history of this district and are equally out of touch with the habits, needs and requirements of its people. Anyone who wants to do some justice to the people of this district, belated though it be, would do well to peruse and study its past history from the memorable minute of the Hon'ble Mr. Robinson, Second Member of the Board of Revenue, dated 3rd December 1870. Therein he will find traced most authoritatively how step by step after the advent of the British rule in this district in 1799 the valuable and immemorial private rights of the people of this district were confiscated and deprived one by one. To Mr. Robinson and to some of the Collectors of South Kanara quoted in that minute who put up a stubborn fight for the Kanara cultivator as against the inroads of the enthusiast of the Forest department on the one hand who appear to have existed even at that time, and those of the Revenue Department on the other, the ryots of Kanara shall ever be grateful though it must be admitted that all along it has been a losing fight! Therein one will find how private rights in land in this district were in no way different from those in the sister district of Malabar. The only difference in the ultimate result appears to be largely due to the fact that whilst in Kanara the people begged and petitioned and begged and lost, the people of Malabar appear to have taken to stronger and more convincing methods and won. In the said minute and in the proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 21st March 1871, which conceded the substantial justice of the people's claim urged by Mr. Robinson, will be found a chapter both as to the forest as well as the land revenue administration of this district which exposes the systematic confiscation of private rights and privileges which had begun prior thereto but has gone on ever since and continues to do even to-day. Let it be clearly remembered that the concessions so-called are after all the survivals of some of these old rights and privileges. It will be well for the Forest department to remember that the forests in question were being enjoyed by the agriculturists of the vicinity for hundreds of years prior to their reservation for the satisfaction of all their domestic and agricultural needs and that these concessions are not mere favours created and bestowed for the first time by Government. This was expressly admitted by Government in their answer to question No. 650 asked in the Legislative Council on 11th October 1924 by the member for South Kanara, Mr. B. Mahabala Hegde (now Diwan Bahadur). It was stated by Government that the reserve forests of this district of the IV class numbering 59 were being enjoyed prior to such reservation by the agriculturists for the above purposes. The fact is that, except for the immemorial forests on the ghaut section of this district, most of the rest of the lands including the forests therein were the properties of the people. States the Imperial Gazetteer of India (1886), Volume 7, page 376: "The forest land is of vast extent, but the exact area is unknown, as the district (South Kanara) has never been surveyed. Most of the land is private property, and only a few forests near the ghauts are owned by Government." The holdings or 'wargs' of the people included not only the actual lands under cultivation but also the surrounding tracts of hilly wastes which grow the necessary grass,



[30th January 1934]

fuel, green manure and other materials so necessary for the cultivation of the wet lands and gardens and forming a necessary adjunct thereto. Previous to the advent of the British rule and for nearly a century thereafter the assessment payable to Government on such an holding was fixed with respect to its entire extent and not merely with respect to the cultivated portion thereof. The proprietors called 'wargdars' or 'mulgars' had in their possession what were called 'mulpattas' or 'title deeds,' some of which were found in 1800 by Mr. Munro, the first British Collector of the district, to be even 300 or 400 years old and which gave to their owners the most complete form of private property ever known in any country. What happened subsequently to these mulpattas and to the valuable rights of which they were the muniments of title is too sad a tale to recount. Nor would all that be necessary in this connexion except to inform the high officials of the Forest department as to why Kanara alone enjoys these concessions free and why it should be free hereafter also. Suffice it to say that many of these private forests were reserved as Government forests paying practically little or no compensation. In their place, as shadows for the substance, were granted these forest concessions in the reserves on the one hand and what are called 'kumki' privileges on the other. The former are now tottering whilst with the many inroads that have been made upon the latter from time to time they have now become as precarious as ever. It looks as if all that one can do is to appeal to the sense of justice of Government, and to 'Heaven' above in the last resort!

16. Having said this much the association would like to assure Government of their readiness to co-operate with them in their attempts to see that the concessions in question are used as fairly and properly as may practicably be possible. The association feels that the people who benefit by these concessions should to some extent at least be prepared to come forward and share the responsibility of the protection of the forests concerned. The question of the working of panchayats for this purpose has been both put to the people as well as considered by the Executive Committee of the association but unfortunately it is found from past experience in this district as well as by the local peculiarities that the panchayats do not work satisfactorily at all. One chief reason for it is that unlike as in the East Coast districts where the villagers live in a centralized and compact area and can easily watch one another, here all the district over one would find houses and properties spread out in almost every nook and corner. Some villagers will be found living on the edge of a forest whilst there will be others living even four or five miles away. It is extremely difficult for people to work in such conditions as a panchayat and assume the entire responsibility of the protection of a forest either from the abuse of the concessions or from fires. The association has however asked some of the villagers concerned and they have agreed to form some form of 'vigilance committees' to undertake the responsibility of reporting cases of abuse to the concerned officers of the Forest department and to keep a general watch on the proper use of the concessions by the people. This was expressly put to the ryots assembled at the Kirimanjeshwar meeting

30th January 1934]

and approved by them. The association would undertake in the first instance to organize such committees of responsible ryots with a view to achieve the above purpose.

17. The association would earnestly urge upon Government the imperative need of lessening the rigors of the forest laws in respect of the reserves in question and also in similarly situated reserves with a view to meet and adjust the increasing demands of cultivation. Larger extents of lands from out of these reserves must be made available to the people who are ever-increasing population. If the Forest department, situated as it is, cannot be made to change their angle of vision, the association would urge very strongly to put all such reserve forests under the Revenue Department as the latter are in touch with the people, know their difficulties, and are responsible for the timely collection of thousands of rupees in the shape of land revenue from the people of these areas. If this cannot be done, the association would earnestly press upon Government the need for the constitution of a representative committee for the whole district in which the Forest department, the Collector of the district and responsible non-official representatives of the ryots who are affected by the reserves in the district might be represented. This committee might meet once or twice a year and discuss the hardships of the ryots whether with respect to the concessions or otherwise or the charges of abuses that may be brought against the people by the department and thereby exercise a proper influence on the ryot population concerned.

18. Next the association would urge some modifications of the rules governing these concessions so that they may be capable of practical use and enforcement and may satisfy the particular and special needs of particular localities. For instance, as already stated, there is no use in sticking fast to the entire list of the 35 species prohibiting people from removing leaves and twigs. The number should be reduced to a reasonable limit, regard being had to the sufficiency or otherwise of particular species in particular localities. Or again take the case of the removal of undergrowth in coastal reserves up to a limit of 200 yards from the limits of private holdings or half a mile in the case of others. As the Conservator remarks in his report referred to above this rule has not been of much practical utility. As the Conservator observes the main object of this concession is to keep away the wild beasts from the cultivation. But surely the means of an average cultivator do not allow him to clear away all this wide and indefinite belt. What would really achieve this object and which would be well within his means, and at the same time make the concession incapable of abuse, is to so modify it as to permit him to clear away a belt of say only 50 yards in the first instance allowing him to cut and remove all kinds of shrubs and trees, subject of course to the claim of the Forest department for such trees cut; and if he so clears that belt, to allow him to cut another 50 yards with similar conditions. The exact form of the rule proposed above might be altered after discussion but on the lines indicated the rule will go a great way to reduce the devastation of crops by the wild animals particularly the wild-boars and monkeys.

[30th January 1934]

19. In conclusion the association begs to urge upon Government the imperative need of cancelling forthwith the withdrawal of the concessions and to see that the legitimate needs of the people are met as far as possible and are not altogether denied and also to take on hand the changes proposed herein as early as possible.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

(Signed) \_\_\_\_\_,

Secretary, *The South Kanara  
Landholders' Association.*

MANGALORE,  
8th November 1933.

#### APPENDIX IV.

[Vide item IV at page 141 supra.]

BILL No. 11 OF 1933.

THE MADRAS PUBLIC LIBRARIES BILL.

To

THE HONOURABLE THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL  
OF THE GOVERNOR OF MADRAS.

WE, the members of the Select Committee appointed to consider the Madras Public Libraries Bill (Bill No. 11 of 1933), have the honour to submit the following report.

2. The Bill was published in the *Fort St. George Gazette* in English on the 15th August 1933, in Tamil, Kanarese and Telugu on the 3rd October 1933 and in Malayalam on the 24th October 1933.

3. We met on the 11th and 12th December 1933 and on the 16th January 1934 and considered the provisions of the Bill. On the 18th January 1934, we met and passed our report.

4. We have made various changes in the Bill. The following are some of the more important of them.



30th January 1934]

*Clause 3.*

The draft Bill had not provided for bringing within its scope private libraries. They have now been brought within its scope. A definition has been accordingly added to clause 3 defining a "recognized library."

*Clause 6.*

It is desirable to specify as far as possible in one place the powers and duties of the Provincial Library Committee. Clause 6 has therefore been so amended as to enumerate the powers and duties of the Provincial Library Committee.

As regards the constitution of the Committee, the names of the Director of Public Instruction, the Librarian of the Connemara Public Library, the Librarian of the Madras University Library and one member appointed by each of the linguistic library committees to be constituted under the Act, have been added. The provision for the representation of the Madras Library Association by two members elected by its Council has been omitted and in its stead the number of persons to be nominated by the Local Government has been increased from two to four. It is expected that in nominating persons to the Committee, the Local Government will take into consideration the claims of established library associations in the Presidency, to due representation on the Committee.

A new chapter has been added after Chapter III to provide for the constitution of Linguistic library committees. The constitution of such committees is to be provided for by rules framed for the purpose by the Local Government. The powers of the Linguistic library committees shall be merely advisory.

A new clause has been added after clause 7 of the Bill in order to give direct power to the local library authorities to establish and maintain public libraries.

*Clause 8.*

In regard to the constitution of every local library authority, the District Educational Officer has been added as ex-officio member of the Library Committee of the district board concerned; and a new clause has been

[30th January 1934]

added empowering local library authorities to act under this Act where any conflict should arise between the powers given under this Act and the powers already possessed by them under their constitution.

A new chapter regarding recognized libraries has been added and it provides that no charge shall be levied for admission to a recognized library or for the use of the library within the premises. While public libraries will be under an obligation to lend out free of charge, private libraries are not obliged to do so. Provision has also been made for grants being made to recognized libraries by the Local Government, Corporation of Madras, district boards and municipalities and for inspection of them.

*Clause 31.*

The rule-making power of the Local Government has been extended so as to include, as a necessary consequence of the amendments already proposed, rules for the conditions of the recognition of libraries as recognized libraries, for constituting linguistic library committees and for making contributions and grants-in-aid to recognized libraries. We have also decided that the rules framed by the Local Government under section 31 should be placed on the table of the Legislative Council before they become final.

5. As the changes made by us are not very material we do not think it necessary that the Bill should be republished.

A copy of the Bill as amended by us is annexed.

YAKUB HASAN (*Chairman*).

P. SUBBARAYAN.

BASHEER AHMED SAYEED.

ABDUL HAMEED KHAN.

R. MADANAGOPAL.

R. K. VENUGOPAL.

MAHBOOB ALI BAIG.

A. B. SHETTY.

P. S. CHETTY.

K. V. KRISHNASWAMI AYYAR.

V. P. NARAYANAN NAMBIYAR.

GANALA RAMAMURTI.

T. S. RAMASAMI AYYAR.

30th January 1934]

H. M. JAGANNATH.  
C. BASU DEV.  
M. SCHAMNAD.  
W. ERLAM SMITH.  
M. S. SRESHTA.  
U. C. S. BHATT.  
C. NATESAN.  
V. M. RAMASWAMI.  
K. ALAMELUMANGATHAYARAMMA.  
V. T. ARASU.  
V. DHARMALINGAM PILLAI.  
P. BAYAPPA REDDI.  
T. M. MOIDOO.  
P. C. MOSES.  
SAMI VENKATACHALAM.  
S. KUMARASWAMI.  
S. M. K. BEYABANI.  
B. POCKER.  
E. C. SMITH.  
V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI.  
N. GOPALASWAMI.

#### MINUTE OF DISSENT.

Under clause 4, the Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards or such other officer as the Local Government may direct *shall be* the Director of Public Libraries. Under clause 5, the Director shall superintend and direct all matters relating to public libraries and connected with the exercise of powers and performance of duties by local bodies under the Act. He will be ex officio Secretary of the Provincial Library Committee constituted under clause 6. The Committee can delegate to the Director any of its powers and duties detailed in clause 6 (1). The Director seems to have the duty of distributing grants to local library authorities and to recognized libraries. Under clause 11 (1), the Director will have to scrutinize schemes for constitution of libraries and under clause 19 (2) he will have to scrutinize schemes for removal of illiteracy.

Clause 6 (3).

Clause 6 (1)

(a).

Clause 6 (1)

(12).



[30th January 1934]

All these will add very substantially to the Inspector's work if he is to be the Director of Public Libraries under the Act. I do not consider that the office of the Inspector can take on more work than it has at present. I may add that I can find no provision in the Bill indicating who should bear the cost of the superintending staff proposed to be employed.

22nd January 1934.

E. CONRAN SMITH.

## BILL No. 11 OF 1933.

## THE MADRAS PUBLIC LIBRARIES BILL.

*'As amended by the Select Committee.*

WHEREAS it is expedient to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a system of Public Libraries, and for the comprehensive development and organization of rural and urban library service, in the Presidency of Madras;

AND WHEREAS the previous sanction of the Governor-General has been obtained to the passing of this Act;

It is hereby enacted as follows:—

## CHAPTER I.

*Preliminary.*

- |                     |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
|---------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Short title.        | 1. This Act may be called the Madras Public Libraries Act, 193 .                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| Local extent.       | 2. It shall extend to the whole of the Presidency of Madras.                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| Interpretation.     | 3. In this Act, unless there is anything repugnant in the subject or context,—                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| “ Director. ”       | (1) “ Director ” means the Director of Public Libraries;                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| “ Public Library. ” | (2) “ Public Library ” means a Library museum or art gallery established or maintained under the provisions of this Act or the Madras City Municipal Act, 1919, or the Madras District Municipalities Act, 1920, or the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920, as amended from time to time; and |

30th January 1934]

- (3) " Recognized Library " means a Library museum or art gallery established and maintained by an individual or a body other than (i) the Government, (ii) a local library authority, (iii) an university, (iv) an educational institution like a school or college, and other than one established under the provisions of the Madras City Municipal Act, 1919, the Madras District Municipalities Act, 1920, or the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920, but recognized under the provisions of this Act in accordance with the rules made thereunder.

## CHAPTER II.

### *Control of Public Libraries.*

4. The Inspector of Local Boards and Municipalities or such other officer as the Local Government may direct shall be the Director of Public Libraries. Director of Public Libraries.

5. Subject to the control of the Local Government, the Director shall superintend and direct all matters relating to Public Libraries and connected with the exercise of powers and performance of duties by local bodies under this Act. Duties of Director.

## CHAPTER III.

### *Constitution of Provincial Library Committee.*

6. (1) The Local Government shall constitute a Provincial Library Committee which shall have the following powers and duties:— Constitution of Provincial Library Committee.

- (a) To make recommendations to the Local Government on schemes and by-laws submitted under this Act by Local Library authorities.
- (b) To make recommendations to the Local Government on any proposal by a Local Library Authority to raise a library rate.
- (c) To advise the Local Government on the amount that should be set apart every year for contribution towards the library fund maintained by Local Library Authorities and for payment as grant-in-aid to recognized libraries.

[30th January 1934]

- (d) To submit to the Local Government proposals to award special grants to Local Library Authorities and to recognized libraries for specific purposes.
- (e) To advise the Local Government on the request received from a Local Library Authority for sanction to borrow money for any of the purposes under this Act.
- (f) To maintain a list of recognized libraries and to include in the list and to remove from it the names of libraries from time to time.
- (g) To arrange for the periodic inspection of Public Libraries and recognized libraries.
- (h) To submit for consideration by the Local Government draft rules for carrying into effect the purposes of this Act.
- (i) To frame standing orders to regulate its own business.
- (j) To constitute committees for dealing with questions coming within its purview and to delegate any of its powers to them.
- (k) To delegate any of its powers to the Director of Public Libraries.
- (l) To frame regulations for the guidance of the Director of Public Libraries in distributing the grants to Local Library Authorities and to recognized libraries.
- (m) To frame regulations for the academic and professional qualifications necessary for different grades of librarians and library staff.
- (n) To arrange for the professional training of librarians and library staff either through the universities or other agencies or by the maintenance of a School of Library Science.
- (o) To stimulate the publication of books suitable for Public Libraries and of proper bibliographical standard.
- (p) To arrange for the publication of book lists from time to time for helping Library Committees of Local Library Authorities and recognized libraries, in book selection.



30th January 1934]

- (q) To arrange for research in and standardization of library practice, library furniture and library apparatus.
- (r) To consider the annual report submitted by the Director of Public Libraries and submit the same with modifications, if necessary, to the Local Government on the progress made by the Local Library Authorities in regard to the working of this Act.
- (s) To frame model schemes for the guidance of Local Library Authorities.
- (t) To frame model by-laws for the guidance of Local Library Authorities.
- (u) To frame model library rules for the guidance of Library Committees of Local Library Authorities and recognized libraries.
- (v) To refer specific questions to linguistic Library Committees under this Act and to consider their advice and to take such action on it as may be deemed necessary.
- (w) To convene conferences of representatives of Local Library Authorities and other bodies interested in library work to consider general questions of library policy and library standards.
- (x) To exercise such other powers and perform such other duties as may be necessary for the proper administration and execution of this Act and the rules and regulations framed thereunder.

(2) The Committee shall consist of the following Membership.  
members, namely:—

- (a) the Minister in charge of Education;
- (b) the Director;
- (c) the Director of Public Instruction, Madras;
- (d) the Librarian, Connemara Public Library;
- (e) the Librarian, Madras University Library;

[30th January 1934]

- (f) one member appointed by each of the Linguistic Library Committees constituted under this Act;
- (g) three persons elected by the Legislative Council; and
- (h) four persons appointed by the Local Government.

President  
and  
Secretary.

(3) The Minister in charge of Education and the Director shall respectively be the President and the Secretary of the Committee.

Term of  
office.

(4) Members of the Committee other than *ex officio* members shall hold office for three years from the date of their election or appointment, as the case may be.

#### Chapter IV.

##### *Constitution of Linguistic Library Committees.*

Constitution  
of Linguis-  
tic Library  
Committees.

7. (1) There shall be a Linguistic Library Committee for each of the following languages, namely, Tamil, Malayalam, Kanarese, Telugu, Urdu and such other languages which the Provincial Committee may decide upon, to be constituted by the Local Government in accordance with the rules framed for that purpose.

Powers and  
duties.

(2) The Linguistic Library Committee shall advise the Provincial Library Committee on such matters arising under this Act, as may be referred to them.

#### CHAPTER V.

##### *Constitution of Local Library Authority.*

Local  
Library  
Authority.

8. (1) For the purpose of organizing and administering Public Libraries there shall be a Local Library Authority for the area of each Municipality and each District Board.

Its constitu-  
tion.

(2) Such Authority shall be—

- (a) for the City of Madras, the Corporation of Madras;
- (b) for a District Municipality, the Municipal Council thereof; and
- (c) for the area of every District Board, the District Board of the district.

30th January 1934]

9. In addition to the powers in this behalf which a Local Library Authority may possess under any other enactment for the time being, it shall be competent to a Local Library Authority to establish and maintain Public Libraries.

10. For the area of every Local Library Authority, there shall also be a Library Committee, constituted in accordance with the scheme made under the provisions of this Act:

authenticated  
by the  
Library  
Committee.

Provided that the District Educational Officer shall be an ex officio member of the Library Committee for the District Board.

The powers and duties of Local Library Authorities in respect of libraries shall be exercised in accordance with the provisions of this Act, notwithstanding anything contained in any other enactment for the time being.

11. (1) Any Local Library Authority may, and, if required by the Local Government, shall submit to the Local Government through the Director, a scheme setting forth the manner in which it proposes to constitute the Library Committee for its area and to perform its duties and exercise its powers in relation to Public Libraries.

Submission  
of Scheme  
by Local  
Library  
Authority.

(2) Every scheme for the constitution of a Library Committee shall, wherever possible, provide, that not less than two of its members shall be persons, who, in the opinion of the Local Library Authority, possess special qualifications for serving on the Library Committee, though they may not be members of the Local Library Authority.

Terms of  
Scheme.

(3) Every scheme submitted by a District Board shall specify the number of villages or panchayats its library service is proposed to reach, any arrangements it has made with them for contribution to its library fund and other matters, if any, conducive to the efficiency of its rural library service. It may also provide for constituting Village Library Committees, wherever necessary, for advising its Library Committee on the local requirements.

Special  
terms of a  
District  
Board  
Scheme and  
Village  
Library  
Committee.

(4) Before submitting a scheme under this section, the Local Library Authority shall publish its

Publication  
of Scheme.



[30th January 1934]

proposals in such manner as it may consider suitable or as the Local Government may require, and shall consider any representations made to it by any person or body of persons in respect thereof.

Modification  
and replace-  
ment by new  
scheme.

(5) Any scheme under this section may, with the approval of the Local Government, be modified or replaced by a new scheme; and the provisions of subsection (4) shall apply to such new scheme in like manner as they apply to an original scheme submitted under this section.

## CHAPTER VI.

### *Approval of Scheme.*

Approval of  
Scheme by  
Local Gov-  
ernment.

12. (1) The Local Government may approve any scheme submitted to them under this Act by a Local Library Authority, and thereupon it shall be the duty of the Local Library Authority to give effect to the scheme.

Return of  
Scheme.

(2) If the Local Government are of opinion that a scheme does not make adequate provision for all or any of the purposes to which the scheme relates or that the scheme requires modification for any other reason, they may return the same to the Local Library Authority with suggestions for its modification.

## CHAPTER VII.

### *Powers and Duties of Library Committee.*

Reference to  
Library  
Committee.

13. (1) All matters relating to the performance of any duties or the exercise of any powers under this Act by a Local Library Authority (other than the power of raising a rate or borrowing money) shall be referred to the Library Committee appointed for its area, and the Local Library Authority before performing any duties or exercising any powers, shall receive and consider such report:

Provided that in cases where in the opinion of a Local Library Authority, a matter is urgent, such reference or consideration shall not be necessary:

Provided further that where action has been taken by a Local Library Authority on the ground of urgency, without such reference or consideration, a

30th January 1934]

report of the action taken and the circumstances which necessitated the taking of such action, shall be placed before the Library Committee at its next meeting.

(2) The Local Library Authority may delegate to the Library Committee, subject to such restrictions or conditions as it may impose, any powers or duties under this Act (other than the power of raising a rate or borrowing money). Delegation to Library Committee.

14. A Library Committee may, subject to any directions of the Local Library Authority, appoint such and so many sub-committees consisting either wholly or partly of members of the Committee, as it thinks fit. Appointment of Sub-Committees.

## CHAPTER VIII.

### *Co-operation and Constitution of Regional Committee.*

15. (1) For the purpose of performing any duties or exercising any powers under this Act, a Local Library Authority may enter into such arrangements as it may think proper for co-operation with any other Local Library Authority or Authorities and any such arrangements may provide for the appointment of a Joint Committee, for the delegation to that Committee of any powers or duties of the Local Library Authorities (other than the power of raising a rate or borrowing money), for the contribution to be paid by each such Local Library Authority, and for any other matters which may be necessary for carrying out the arrangement. Arrangement for co-operation

(2) A report of the arrangements made under sub-section (1) and of the constitution, powers and duties of the Joint Committee, if any, shall, within fifteen days, be made to the Director. Report to Director.

16. (1) The Local Government may, on the application of two or more Local Library Authorities, by scheme provide for the constitution and establishment of a Regional Committee for their combined area, for such purposes as may be specified in the scheme as being purposes relating to matters of common interest Constitution of Regional Committee.

[30th January 1934]

concerning libraries which it is necessary or convenient to be dealt with in relation to a group of Local Library Authorities:

Provided that no Local Library Authority shall be included in such scheme without its consent and no Local Library Authority shall be obliged to continue in the scheme except in accordance with the provisions of the scheme to which it has consented.

Powers of  
Regional  
Committee.

(2) Where a Regional Committee has been constituted as above mentioned, it shall exercise such of the powers and perform such of the duties of a Local Library Authority (other than the power of raising a rate or borrowing money) as may be necessary for carrying out the purposes for which it was constituted.

Modifica-  
tion and  
replacement  
by new  
scheme.

(3) A scheme constituting a Regional Committee may, on the application of one or more of the Local Library Authorities concerned, be modified or replaced by a new scheme, and such scheme shall provide for dealing with any properties or liabilities of the Regional Committee, when the Regional Committee is discontinued.

## CHAPTER IX.

### *Powers and Duties of Local Library Authority.*

Vesting of  
property.

17. All movable and immovable properties acquired or held for any Public Library, or for any of the purposes of this Act, shall be vested in the Local Library Authority concerned.

Powers and  
duties of  
Local  
Library  
Authority.

18. (1) The Local Library Authority may, for organizing and administering its Public Libraries or for exercising any powers or performing any duties under this Act—

(a) provide suitably-fitted buildings, books, periodicals, newspapers, maps, specimens of Art and Science, lantern slides, cinema reels, apparatus, other necessary materials and conveniences;

(b) acquire, purchase or hire land or other properties, and erect, take down, rebuild, alter, repair and extend buildings and fit



30th January 1934]

up, furnish and supply the same with the requisite furniture, fittings and conveniences;

(c) accept any endowment for any purpose connected with this Act;

(d) subject to the rules framed by the Local Government in this behalf, appoint salaried officers and servants, punish and dismiss them; and

(e) provide for lectures and such other activities as may be conducive to the carrying out of the purposes of this Act.

(2) With the previous sanction of the Local Government, the Local Library Authority may discontinue any Public Library provided by it or change the site of any such institution.

Discontinu-  
ance of  
Public  
Library and  
change of  
site.

19. (1) Where in the opinion of a Local Library Authority, the adult population within its area or any part or class thereof is unable by reason of illiteracy to take full advantage of the benefits of the library service provided by it, it may cause an enquiry to be made by the Library Committee touching the conditions as regards such illiteracy within the area, other schemes at work for the removal of the same, the funds, other than public funds, available for the purpose, and all other relevant matters.

Enquiry  
before  
scheme for  
removal of  
illiteracy  
among  
adults.

(2) The Local Library Authority shall then consider the report of the enquiry furnished by the Library Committee and submit through the Director a scheme to the Local Government setting forth any proposals as to the manner in which it intends to provide for the removal of such illiteracy and the funds it proposes to spend for the purpose.

Scheme for  
removal of  
illiteracy.

(3) Without prejudice to the powers above mentioned, it shall be competent to a Local Library Authority, for the like purpose,—

Co-operation  
with other  
persons or  
bodies.

(a) to associate with any person or body of persons willing to co-operate in the matter; and

(b) to aid such person or body of persons by giving the use of such of its lands, buildings, furniture, apparatus, or other property, as may be necessary.

[30th January 1934]

But, save as provided in a scheme approved by the Local Government, it shall not expend moneys or make grants.

## CHAPTER X.

### *Admission to Public Libraries.*

Admission to  
Public  
Libraries.

**20.** No charge shall be made for admission to a Public Library provided by a Local Library Authority or, in the case of a lending library, for the use thereof by the inhabitants of the area of such Local Library Authority; but the Library Authority, if it thinks fit, may grant the use of a lending library to persons not being inhabitants of the area, either gratuitously or for payment.

By-laws by  
Local  
Library  
Authority.

**21.** Subject to the provisions of this Act, a Local Library Authority may make by-laws,—

- (a) for regulating the use of the Public Libraries under its control, the contents thereof and the admission of the public thereto;
- (b) for protecting the same and the furniture and contents thereof from injury, misuse or destruction;
- (c) for requiring any guarantee or security from any person using them and against the loss of or injury to any books or other articles; and
- (d) for enabling the officers and servants of the Library Authority to exclude or remove therefrom any person offending against the provisions of this Act or the by-laws.

Offences and  
punishment.

**22.** (1) Any person (i) who in a Public Library or other institution maintained under this Act, to the annoyance or disturbance of any person using the same—

- (a) behaves in a disorderly manner; or
- (b) uses violent, abusive or obscene language; or

(ii) who, after proper warning, persists in remaining therein beyond the hours fixed for closing;

shall be liable to be excluded or removed forthwith from the premises, and shall also be liable on conviction to a penalty not exceeding ten rupees.

30th January 1934]

(2) An offence committed under the above sub-section shall be triable in the manner provided for summary trials by Chapter XXII of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898. Trial of offence.

## CHAPTER XI.

### *Acquisition and Alienation of Lands.*

23. Any immovable property required by a Local Library Authority shall be deemed to be land needed for a public purpose within the meaning of section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act of 1894, and may be acquired under that Act. Acquisition under Land Acquisition Act.

24. A Local Library Authority may, with the approval of the Local Government, sell any lands or buildings vested in it, or exchange any such lands or buildings for any other lands or buildings and the money arising from the sale or received in part exchange, shall be used for the purchase of other lands or may be applied for any purposes for which capital money may be applied, as approved by the Local Government. Alienation of land.

## CHAPTER XII.

### *Finance.*

25. (1) With the previous sanction of the Local Government, a Local Library Authority may raise a library rate in such manner and at such rate as may be determined by it from time to time. Power to raise rate.

(2) Such rate when payable to a district board or a municipal council or the Corporation of Madras shall be liable to be collected in the same manner as other taxes payable under the provisions of the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920, the Madras District Municipalities Act, 1920, or the Madras City Municipal Act, 1919, respectively. Mode of collection.

26. (1) Every Local Library Authority shall maintain a fund called the Library Fund from which its expenses shall be met. Library Fund.

(2) To this fund shall be credited,—

(a) any amount raised as library rate;

Credits to Library Fund.



[30th January 1934]

- (b) the amounts, if any, which may be transferred to it from the general funds of the body which has been constituted the Local Library Authority;
- (c) amounts realized from endowments, if any;
- (d) any contributions received from other bodies or persons;
- (e) any amounts that the Local Government may contribute towards the fund; and
- (f) any special grants that the Local Government may make for specific purposes, with or without conditions or limitations.

Power to  
borrow.

27. A Local Library Authority may with the sanction of the Local Government borrow money for any of the purposes under this Act on such security as the Local Government may approve.

### CHAPTER XIII.

#### *Accounts, Audit, etc.*

Maintenance  
of accounts.

28. (1) Separate accounts shall be kept of the receipts and expenditure of a Local Library Authority and the same shall be audited like the other accounts of the local body constituting such Local Library Authority. The audited statement and the report accompanying it shall be published in such manner as the Local Library Authority may determine or the Local Government may require.

Inspection  
of accounts.

(2) All accounts maintained by a Local Library Authority shall be open, at all reasonable hours, to inspection by any rate-payer within the area and he may make copies and extracts.

### CHAPTER XIV.

#### *Inspection, Returns, Reports, etc.*

Inspection  
of Public  
Library.

29. The Local Government may by their officers or by other organization inspect any Public Library or other institution maintained by a Local Library Authority for the purpose of satisfying themselves whether the purposes of this Act are being properly fulfilled.

30th January 1934]

**30.** (1) It shall be competent to the Local Government to hold a public enquiry for the purpose of exercising any of their powers or performing any of their duties under this Act.

Public enquiry.

(2) A copy of the report of such enquiry shall be furnished to the Local Library Authority concerned before action is taken upon it.

Report to be furnished to Local Library Authority.

**31.** A Local Library Authority shall send such reports and returns and give such information to the Local Government as they may require.

Reports, returns, and information to Local Government.

**32.** The Local Government shall annually lay before the Legislative Council a report of the progress made in regard to the working of this Act during the preceding year.

Report by Local Government to Legislative Council.

## CHAPTER XV.

### *Recognized Libraries.*

**33.** (i) No charge shall be made for admission to a recognized library or for the use of the library within the premises.

Recognized libraries.

(ii) The Local Government, the Corporation of Madras, the district boards and the district municipalities within whose local areas a recognized library is situate may contribute to the finances of such recognized libraries subject to the rules framed in this behalf.

(iii) The Local Government may by their officers or by other organizations inspect a recognized library in order to satisfy themselves that the purposes of this Act are being properly fulfilled and that they conform to the rules.

(iv) Any person (1) who in a recognized library, to the annoyance or disturbance of any person using the same,—

(a) behaves in a disorderly manner; or

(b) uses violent, abusive, or obscene language; or

[30th January 1934]

(2) who, after proper warning, persists in remaining therein beyond the hours fixed for closing; shall be liable to be excluded or removed forthwith from the premises, and shall also be liable on conviction to a penalty not exceeding ten rupees.

(v) An offence committed under the above sub-section shall be triable in the manner provided for summary trials by Chapter XXII of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898.

## CHAPTER XVI.

### *Rules and By-laws.*

Power to  
make rules  
by Local  
Government.

Subject  
matter of  
rules.

34. (1) The Local Government may, by notification in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, make rules consistent with this Act for carrying into effect the purposes of this Act.

(2) In particular and without prejudice to the generality of the foregoing power, such rules may provide,

- (a) for prescribing outlines of the scheme to be submitted under Section 11 and the manner in which publicity shall be given to any proposed scheme;
- (b) for the maintenance of the minutes of proceedings by Local Library Authorities and the inspection thereof;
- (c) for the accounts to be maintained by the Local Library Authorities and where any powers or duties have been delegated to Library Committees, by such committees;
- (d) for the auditing of the accounts, the conditions under which rate-payers may appear before the auditors, inspect books and vouchers and take exception to items entered therein or omitted therefrom and the publication of the audited statement and the report accompanying it;
- (e) the conditions of service of the salaried officers and servants of the Local Library Authority;



30th January 1934]

(f) the conditions of recognition of libraries as recognized libraries;

(g) for constituting linguistic library committees under this Act;

(h) for making contributions and grants-in-aid to recognized libraries by the Local Government, the Corporation of Madras, District Boards and Municipalities; and

(i) for all other matters which have to be dealt with by rules under this Act.

(3) All such rules shall be laid on the table of the Legislative Council before they become final.

35. (1) The Local Library Authority shall have power to make by-laws, not inconsistent with this Act or the rules made thereunder, for the efficient exercise of its powers, the due fulfilment of its duties and the proper administration and execution of this Act.

Power to make by-laws by Local Library Authority.

(2) Such by-laws may provide,

(a) for the procedure and meetings of the Library Committee;

Subject matter of by-laws.

(b) for defining the powers and duties of the Library Committee;

(c) for the due performance by all its officers and servants of the duties assigned to them; and

(d) for all other matters which have to be dealt with by-laws under this Act.

(3) A copy of the by-laws made under this section shall be submitted, as early as possible, to the Local Government, who may suggest such alterations or amendments thereof, as they may think fit.

Submission of by-laws to Local Government.

[30th January 1934]

## APPENDIX V.

[Vide item XIII—Papers laid on the table of the House—at page 197 supra.]

## LAW (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT.

U.O. NOTE No. 6766 C-5, DATED THE 22ND JANUARY 1934.

## COMMUNICATION TO THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

With reference to the answer to the supplementary question to Legislative Council Question No. 410 answered on 8th November 1933, the information contained in the annexure hereto is placed on the table of the House.

V. N. VISWANATHA RAO,  
Secretary to Government.

To the Secretary, Legislative Council office.

## ANNEXURE.

## QUESTION No. 410—STARRED.

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed.

Will the Hon'ble the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that 14 of the under-trial prisoners in the Madras Conspiracy case are kept in three small rooms ; and

(b) if so, how many are kept in each room and what the dimensions are of the rooms and what the arrangements provided for their daily needs and calls of nature are ?

*Answer.*

(a) As there was over-crowding in the under-trial yard of the Penitentiary, Madras, 14 of the under-trial prisoners concerned in the Madras Conspiracy case were for a time kept in three large cells. When room was available later on, they were given a separate association block in the under-trial yard itself. Five of them were subsequently classified as special class under-trials, and the remaining nine were given the alternative of having an association block or having the three cells. They chose to occupy the three cells.

(b) Originally when there were 14 under-trials in the cells, four were confined in one cell and five in each of the other two cells. Subsequently, when there were nine, three were kept in each of the cells. The dimensions of the cells are 12' 5" × 9' 10" × 14' 1" or 12' 5". During the day-time they used the general latrine in the under-trial yard and in the nights they were provided with urine pots in the urinal recesses provided in the cells.